INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

(cont'd)

Defense! Witnesses	Page
YAMAWAKI, Masataka (cont'd)	
Direct (cont'd) by Mr. BANNO	30101
Cross by Judge Nyi	30107
Questions by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	30123
Cross (cont'd) by Judge Nyi	30123
AFTERNOON RECESS	30130
Redirect by Mr. BANNO Redirect (cont'd) by Mr. KATO	30132 30136
(Witness excused)	30138
MADOKORO, Shintaro	30141
Direct by Mr. BANNO	30141
(Witness excused)	30141
OKADA, Yoshimasa (recalled)	30147
Direct by Mr. BANNO	30147

Matters pertaining to military discipline and morals were customarily handled as top secret matters. MR. BANNO: That concludes my redirect, your Honor. MR. KATO: I am Counsel KATO, for the defendant DCHIHARA. There is one additional question I should like to ask the witness. THE PRESIDENT: You are too late. You are right out of order. Is it a question in further re-examination? MR. KATO: Only one point. I should like to ask just one question relative to prosecution document 1005-21, which is now court exhibit 3302.

2 3

4 5

7

9

10

8

11

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. KATO:

This exhibit reads as follows: From Major HARUKI of DOHIHARA Agency to Vice Minister and also to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA. What is the meaning of this "To: Lieutenant General DOHIHARA"?

A Because Major HARUKI and Lieutenant General DOHIHARA were located at different places this particular document was sent through the Ministry of War to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA.

This telegram is dated April 21, 1939. Had not Lieutenant General DOHIHARA already been appointed commander of the 5th Army and was he not then in Tokyo in order to take over his new post?

I have no exact recollection but I believe that this communication was sent to the War Ministry with the request that it be communicated to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA because he was then in Tokyo.

Then let me ask you: Do you know when Lieutenant General DOHIHARA assumed his new post as Commander of the 5th Army?

I have no recollection.

Q My next point: This telegram purports to come from Major HARUKI of the DOHIHARA Agency. Is it not a fact that already by this time Colonel

REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. KATO:

Q This exhibit reads as follows: From Major HARUKI of DOHIHARA Agency to Vice Minister and also to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA. What is the meaning of this "To: Lieutenant General DOHIHARA"?

A Because Major HARUKI and Lieutenant General DOHIHARA were located at different places this particular document was sent through the Ministry of War to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA.

Q This telegram is dated April 21, 1939.

Had not Lieutenant General DOHIHARA already been appointed commander of the 5th Army and was he not then in Tokyo in order to take over his new post?

A I have no exact recollection but I believe that this communication was sent to the War Ministry with the request that it be communicated to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA because he was then in Tokyo.

Q Then let me ask you: Do you know when Lieutenant General DOHIHARA assumed his new post as Commander of the 5th Army?

A I have no recollection.

Q My next point: This telegram purports to come from Major HARUKI of the DOHIHARA Agency. Is it not a fact that already by this time Colonel

1 2

4

5

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

11

14

16

15

17

19

20

22

23

25

REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. KATO:

Q This exhibit reads as follows: From Major HARUKI of DOHIHARA Agency to Vice Minister and also to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA. What is the meaning of this "To: Lieutenant General DOHIHARA"?

A Because Major HARUKI and Lieutenant General DOHIHARA were located at different places this particular document was sent through the Ministry of War to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA.

Q This telegram is dated April 21, 1939.

Had not Lieutenant General DOHIHARA already been appointed commander of the 5th Army and was he not then in Tokyo in order to take over his new post?

A I have no exact recollection but I believe that this communication was sent to the War Ministry with the request that it be communicated to Lieutenant General DOHIHARA because he was then in Tokyo.

Q Then let me ask you: Do you know when Lieutenant General DOHIHARA assumed his new post as Commander of the 5th Army?

A I have no recollection.

Q My next point: This telegram purports to come from Major HARUKI of the DOHIHARA Agency. Is it not a fact that already by this time Colonel

terms.

.....

2

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

14

16

15

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

25

registration of the DOHJHARA Agency? In short, what I want to ask you is this: Was not this telegram actually sent after DOHIHARA had already left Shanghai by the KAGESA Agency?

A I do not remember.

MR. KATO: Thank you.

MR. BANNO: May the witness be excused?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BANNO: We now offer in evidence the affidavit of the witness KAGESA, Sadaaki, defense document No. 2606, who remains so ill in the hospital that he cannot appear in court.

We present defense document No. 2663, a certificate of attending physician regarding his illness.

THE PRESIDENT: Judge Nyi.

JUDGE NYI: Your Honor, we object to this form of introducing the said affidavit because the witness will not be available for cross-examination.

This witness has once before testified before a commission at the First National Hospital only about ten minutes' ride from this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: If he were here, how much of

Duda & Spratt

Q You further know that it was the position of Admiral NOMURA that this section 14 was not received in time to enable the decoding and the typing and the delivery of this note within the time before the attack on Pearl Harbor, do you not?

A It was only later that I learned that that was the state of affairs at the time.

Q Now, who were your seniors who directed that you delay the sending of part 14?

A As I have been saying, the 14th section was not delayed; nor was there any intention to delay it. With respect to the cabling of the telegram, the naval high command was extremely interested in this data, and after discussing matters with them and in accordance with the instructions of my seniors to see that the secret was preserved with utmost care in the filing of this message, arrangements were made to send the note, to telegraph the note in sections and at different times.

Q Well, suppose you tell us who your seniors were. That may be shorter.

A My seniors were Foreign Minister TOGO and Vice-Foreign Minister NISHI.

Q You have stated in your affidavit that you attended all the Liaison Conferences during the TOGO

Now, the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau 1 was present also, wasn't he? 2 The Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau 3 of the War Ministry and the Chief of the Naval Affairs Bureau of the Navy Ministry attended the meetings as 5 secretaries. And MUTO at this time was present as the 8 Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau and OKA as Chief 9 of the Naval Affairs Bureau? 10 A Yes. Now, the Chief Secretary of the Cabinet was 12 also present, wasn't he? 13 The Chief Secretary of the Cabinet attended 14 as one of the secretaries of the conference. 15 And the Chief Secretary at this time was 16 HOSHINO, was he not? 17 Yes. 18 The Finance Minister attended also? Q 19 Yes. 20 And that was the accused KAYA? 21 That is so. A 22 Now, you have also told us that you attended 23 most of the Liaison Conferences that were held during 24

Yes, at the time of the third KONOYE Cabinet.

25

the third KONCYE Cabinet?

In meeting that proof, rather those innuendoes, the defense is undertaking to show the hour at which the messages were sent, the hour at which they were received in the United States -- I didn't say "by the United States" -- and the hour by which translation and processing could with diligence have been performed. And the document now under consideration showed nothing more or less than the fact of the hour at which the several messages were heard in the United States, were received in short.

If this proof is relevant to the issue so framed by the prosecution, I feel that the mathematical argument founded on the fact that the number of the document is 1500 something, is of no moment. It doesn't matter where the proof comes from.

I therefore submit that this document is clearly relevant to one of the issues in the case.

THE PRESIDENT: There was no cross-examination of the last two witnesses. I take it that in the absence of anything to the contrary to indicate it, the prosecution do not contest what they said. There was a reference to earlier evidence by prosecution's witness which may imply some challenge of the statements we have heard from the box this morning, but to that extent only.

4

5

7 8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

25

judicially determine this question in order that this case be not unduly prolonged.

THE PRESIDENT: There are no shortcuts to proper judicial determinations. Cross-examination still remains the principal means of testing credit.

MR. TAVENNER: That is perfectly true in the view of the prosecution, and in important and material things we propose to resort to it where we think there is a reasonable chance of developing the prosecution's theory.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1050, a recess was taken until 1110, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

judicially determine this question in order that this case be not unduly prolonged.

THE PRESIDENT: There are no shortcuts to proper judicial determinations. Cross-examination still remains the principal means of testing credit.

MR. TAVENNER: That is perfectly true in the view of the prosecution, and in important and material things we propose to resort to it where we think there is a reasonable chance of developing the

prosecution's theory.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1050, a recess was taken until 1110, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I am confident that no such rule as the one announced exists in the United States. I am certain it does not exist in any court in which I have ever practised.

THE PRESIDENT: What rule are you referring to? State the rule so that we know.

I suggest that cross-examination is always expected where the witness makes an adverse statement, where you have materials on which you can crossexamine, where his statement is not obviously foolish, and where you have not already covered it by your evidence. I know nothing about your United States rules. I am not a United States lawyer. But I do know something about British rules and I do claim that what I say is in accordance with British rules and practice. I have had the advantage of discussing this matter with my colleagues during the recess and I know of no dissent from the rule as stated to you. No cross-examination is called for where a witness is obviously talking foolishly, or is of no consequence; but you are not suggesting for one second that those last two witnesses are in that class. My remarks are

directed to those two witnesses, their testimony.

MR. TAVENNER: I understood your Honor to state that the prosecution, by failure to cross-examine a witness, agreed with the testimony of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Your failure to cross-examine one of those witnesses surprised at least two British judges here, if not three; and at least two, if not three, thought you were admitting what he said.

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor will permit me to continue with the statement that I propose to make, I think I can make myself clear.

THE PRESIDENT: It is no use discussing the different legal systems, it is only a waste of time so far as I can gather. You can always make yourself clear. You can always say that, no matter what my misapprehension may have been, you intended this, that or the other thing, and I will always take it into account, and so will the other judges. That is sufficient. There is no use in discussing the difference between the American system, the British system, the Dutch system, or the Russian system; we have no time for that here, nor would it lead us anywhere.

directed to those two witnesses, their testimony.

MR. TAVENNER: I understood your Honor to state that the prosecution, by failure to cross-examine a witness, agreed with the testimony of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Your failure to cross-examine one of those witnesses surprised at least two British judges here, if not three; and at least two, if not three, thought you were admitting what he said.

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor will permit me to continue with the statement that I propose to make, I think I can make myself clear.

THE PRESIDENT: It is no use discussing the different legal systems, it is only a waste of time so far as I can gather. You can always make yourself clear. You can always say that, no matter what my misapprehension may have been, you intended this, that or the other thing, and I will always take it into account, and so will the other judges. That is sufficient. There is no use in discussing the difference between the American system, the British system, the Dutch system, or the Russian system; we have no time for that here, nor would it lead us anywhere.

7 8

examine on a point that was raised to the Court in a question. I believe that this matter goes deeper than what appears on the surface. I do want to reserve my rights until a future time, if the Court will allow.

of giving a decision today, nor until after it has heard this matter fully argued. I mentioned it in chambers, I think, and I believe now I have the concurrence of all my colleagues, that we will not undertake to advise the accused what they should do. We will decide what are their rights and obligations under the Charter after hearing argument. We will adjourn this matter to be argued later at a time to be fixed.

Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I return to exhibit 2971.

THE PRESIDENT: It has been suggested to me that the prosecution might like to cross-examine the witness YAMAMOTO. He has been in court or about the court since half-past eleven.

MR. BLAKENEY: I have just discussed the matter with Mr. Tavenner and we thought it is better to commence at 3 o'clock.

Meanwhile, then, I shall return to exhibit

ness was on the stand, but its contents were not known to us until after the adjournment of court. Now, there may be other documents which we will find it important to cross examine this witness upon. We will hurry our investigation as much as we can with a view to recalling this witness if it seems advisable.

You may take the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: There are certain questions
which I propose to put to the witness on behalf of a
Member of the Tribunal. These questions refer to
Exhibit 2975, the Outline of Future Diplomatic Measures.

The first question is as follows:
BY THE PRESIDENT:

Q Did you discuss the contents of this document with the Foreign Minister, TOGO?

A With regard to that document, I don't have any clear understanding. May I see the document?

Q That is the document you were recalled for cross-examination on. You surely know what I am talking about. I described it as the Outline of Future Diplomatic Measures vis a vis the United States, if that makes it clear. I don't think it is necessary to tell you that.

A This document was written by me in which I

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

.

7 .

 gathered together and assembled my personal ideas. It was never presented to Foreign Minister TOGO.

Q The second question is this: On what occasion was the alteration in the document made by you?

ments prepared by my subordinates following the receipt of the United States note of November 26, setting forth his views and opinions thereon. It was the general practice for several people or a number of people concerned with the matter to set forth their opinions, and it was my duty to analyze and adopt certain parts and eradicate certain parts. The circumstances under which this document was prepared is that this document was prepared and presented to me by one of my subordinates, upon which I made certain revisions.

Q Was that done after consultation with the Foreign Minister?

A It was entirely my personal idea, and no consultation was hold with the Foreign Minister.

Q Was the document printed?

A The document submitted by my subordinate was typed out, but the revisions made thereon by me was not printed. This document was not an officially approved draft; it was morely a personal draft made

up by me, and that was the state of the document to the very last. Hence this document does not bear neither my signature nor my seal.

24 exhibit number 2975-A.

25

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, the document now being presented includes the interlineations that appear in Document 2975 and which are underscored in the copy of that document. THE PRESIDENT: Will you give us copies of the document last admitted -- English translations -showing the interlineations? MR. TAVENNER: Comparison will show that in the document just presented it appears as one continuous document. There are no interlineations that appear above the line. When the document is given a number I will read the interlineated portions. THE MONITOR: Mr. Tavenner, can we have 13 the Japanese copy or the English copy, either one? MR. TAVENNER: It will be only three or 15 four lines. THE MONITOR: Then it will be the transla-17 18 tion in substance, not the exact words. Will that 19 be all right? MR. TAVENNER: THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution 22 document without document number, being copy of 23 Exhibit 2975 with interlineations, will receive

(Whereupon, the document above

we don't have the opportunity of checking to see how far the excerpt is a proper one and how far it ought to be supplemented. May I draw the attention of the Tribunal in that connection to page 24,897 of the record, where, on the testimony of the witness OKADA, we drew the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that he had produced only parts of documents which he said were in his possession. We asked where the whole of the documents were. First of all, we were told they were in the hands of Dr. KIYOSE; then we were told that they had been filed in the Clerk's office. The latter statement turns out to be completely erroneous, and we haven't seen them yet.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr, we judicially notice the Pact of Paris and everything which is necessary for its correct interpretation. Some of us may think that we can look beyond the clear words of the pact to find out what is the real meaning from the statements made by those responsible for bringing it about. Others may take the view that we are bound by the clear words. At all events, it may not be necessary to prove these statements by Mr. Kellogg, perhaps, or Mr. Stimson, or Mr. Briand. We should judicially notice this if they really bear on the interpretation of the treaty. But that is a matter that

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

25

whose long experience in administrative affairs of the Japanese navy qualifies him to testify authoritatively concerning the organization of the Japanese navy with special reference to the division of duties between the Navy Ministry and the Naval General Staff.

At the same time we offer in evidence defense document 1958, which is a specially-prepared chart showing graphically the relation of the Emperor, the Cabinet, the Navy Ministry and the Naval General Staff, with subordinate offices. This is offered to assist the Tribunal in following the testimony of the witness SAWAMOTO.

I call the witness SAWAMOTO.

YORIO SAWAMOTO, called as a witness in behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERTS:

Q Please state your name and address.

A SAWAMOTO, Yorio, 110 Takinokizaka, Meguro-ku, Tokyo.

MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown defense document No. 1973?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

the principal rules of international law which are taught to the Armies and Navies. There is no contest about that. This doesn't establish any more.

MR. ROBERTS: If the Court will take judicial notice that these precepts of international law were taught at the Japanese naval college, and then we will be satisfied with this witness' testimony to that effect will be unnecessary.

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose the prosecution's case is not that it was not taught but that it was not acted upon. But, we would like to hear from Mr.

Tavenner with a view to shortening this.

MR. ROBERTS: May I just point out that my reference has been to Section 7 of the Indictment which states that, "The educational systems, civil, military and naval, were used to inculcate a spirit of totalitarianism, aggression, desire for war, cruelty and hatred of potential enemies."

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution does not contest the assertion by counsel that international law was taught in the military and naval colleges.

THE PRESIDENT: We are overdue on the recess. We will adjourn until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1202, a recess was taken.)

	1	AFTERNOON SESSION
	2	
	3	The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at
K	4	1330.
a p	5	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
a p 1 e	6	Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
a	7	THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.
&	8	LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the
R	9	Tribunal please, exhibit 2980, defense document 1973,
e	10	was referred to the Arbitration Board.
ch	11	On page 5, line 21, after "was" insert "not.

On page 5, line 21, after "was" insert Thank you. THE PRESIDENT:

Mr. Tavenner.

JUJI ENOMOTO, resumed the stand and testified, through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, continuing with my statement before the close of the morning's session, I didn't object to the introduction of evidence regarding international law being taught in military and naval colleges. I objected on the ground that it was repetitive in the form that it appeared in this affidavit and at great and needless length.

14

15 16

12

13

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: It may seem that at certain points there is repetition, but I think the Court will find that the excerpts mentioned are distinct and separate in each case.

7 8

THE PRESIDENT: We will discharge him on the usual terms. I don't think it will be necessary to recall him.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Brannon will now proceed with additional proof.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: We come now to treat of the prosecution charge that Japan continually and progressively fortified the Islands for which she held a mandate from the League of Nations, in violation of treaty articles 15, 17, 18, and 31 of the Indictment.

I call the witness Hidemi YOSHIDA.

I wish to notify the Language Section we may deviate from time to time from the prepared running commentary.

THE MONITOR: Mr. Brannon, if you do deviate from the running commentary, will you kindly let us know?

MR. BRANNON: Yes.

such order by the Foreign Ministry or by the Navy 1 Ministry. "I recall many instances of foreign visitors 3 calling on me at Palao during my stay there. 4 "(Signed) HAYASHI, Hisao." 5 You may examine. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam. 7 BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the 8 Tribunal, there will be no cross-examination. 9 THE PRESIDENT: The witness is excused on 10 the usual terms. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) 12 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts. 13 MR. ROBERTS: We call as our next witness Shunsuke KONDO. 15 16 18 19 21 22 23

24

25

SHUNSUKE KONDO, called as a witness on
behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
testified, through Japanese interpreters, as ""
follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROBERTS:
Q Please state your name and address.
A My name is KONDO, Shunsuke. My address:
269 1-Chome, Akatsutsumi-machi, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo.
MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown defense
document 1513.
document 1913.

K O N D O, called as a witness on SHUNSUKE 1 behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, 2 testified, through Japanese interpreters, as "" follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. ROBERTS: Please state your name and address. 7 My name is KONDO, Shunsuke. My address: 8 269 1-Chome, Akatsutsumi-machi, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo. 9 MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown defense 10 document 1513. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

21 22

23

24

hostilities and thought that there should be some measures taken to afford them security." You may examine. THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam. BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the Tribunal, we do not wish to cross-examine. THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on the usual terms. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. ROBERTS: We call the witness Junichi OBARA.

JUNICHI OBARA, called as a witness on
behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
testified, through Japanese interpreters, as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERTS:

Q Please state your name and address.

A My name if OBARA, Junichi. My address: 60

A My name if OBARA, Junichi. My address: 60 1-Chome, Tamagawa Okusawa-machi, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo.

MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown defense document 1515.

Q Please examine that document and tell us whether or not it is your sworn affidavit.

A This is my affidavit without mistake.

1	N I S A B U R O M U K A W A, called as a witness
2	on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
3	testified through Japanese interpreters as fol-
4	lows:
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. ROBERTS:
7	Q Will you please state your name and address?
8	A MUKAWA, Nisaburo. My addr -3s is: 601 4-Chome,
9	Koenji, Suginami-ku, Tokyo.
10	MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown
11	defense document 1517.
12	Q Please examine this document and tell us
13	whether or not it is your sworn affidavit?
14	A This is undoubtedly mine.
15	Q Are the contents true and correct?
16	A They are correct.
17	MR. ROBERTS: I offer in evidence defense
19	document No. 1517.
20	THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
21	· CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1517
22	will receive exhibit No. 2994.
23	(Whereupon, the document above
24	referred to was marked defense exhibit
25	No. 2994 and received in evidence.)
	THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen

NISABURO MUKAWA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as fol-3 lows: 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR . ROBERTS: 6 Will you please state your name and address? 7 MUKAWA, Nisaburo. My addr -3s is: 601 4-Chome, 8 9 Koenji, Suginami-ku, Tokyo. MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown 10 11 defense document 1517. 12 Please examine this document and tell us Q 13 whether or not it is your sworn affidavit? 14 This is undoubtedly mine. A 15 Are the contents true and correct? Q 16 They are correct. 17 MR. ROBERTS: I offer in evidence defense 18 document No. 1517. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 20 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1517 21 will receive exhibit No. 2994. 22 (Whereupon, the document above 23 referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2994 and received in evidence.) 25

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen

lie on the slightest provocation or from mere ex-1 pedience." 2 Signed, the 20th day of May, 1947. 3 You may cross-examine. 4 THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam. 5 BRIGADIER QUILLIAM: May it please the 6 Tribunal, we do not cross-examine. 7 MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be excused 8 on the vogular terms? 9 THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. 10 (Whereupon, the witness was 11 12 excused.) MR. ROBERTS: We next call the witness 13 14 SUZUKI, Suguru. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 23 24 25

1	SUGURU SUZUKI, called as a witness on
2	behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
3	testified, through Japanese interpreters, as
4	follows:
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. ROBERTS:
7	Q Please state your name and address.
8	A My name is SUZUKI, Suguru; my address,
9	105 Wakabayashi Machi, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo.
10	Q May the witness be shown defense document
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Reichers & Kapleau

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Q Thank you. This was 1943?

Yes. I heard from Ambassador OSHIMA of the A talk he had had with Hitler, and the Ambassador telegraphed the contents of that talk to Tokyo, and at the end of the telegram there was a request that this matter also be notified to the Minister of the Navy. I think it was about four or five days after the telegram had been sent by the Ambassador to Tokyo, that is to say, around the 5th or 6th of March, I received a telegram from the Minister of the Navy. The telegram " said that the Japanese Navy would accept the offer of Hitler with gratitude and requested that OSHIMA be asked to convey those thanks to the Fuehrer. And furthermore, the telegram included instructions to me to negotiate with the German Naval authorities with regard to the navigation of the submarines. According to my recollection Hitler was not in Berlin at that time, and so Ambassador OSHIMA called on the Foreign Minister, Ribbentrop, and asked him to convey the thanks of the Japanese Navy to him. According to my recollection this question arose between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA for the first time on this occasion.

Q Have you ever heard the contents of the negotiations between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA on this matter?

A Yes.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

Reichers & Kapleau

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Thank you. This was 1943?

Yes. I heard from Ambassador OSHIMA of the talk he had had with Hitler, and the Ambassador telegraphed the contents of that talk to Tokyo, and at the end of the telegram there was a request that this matter also be notified to the Minister of the Navy. I think it was about four or five days after the telegram had been sent by the Ambassador to Tokyo, that is to say, around the 5th or 6th of March, I received a telegram from the Minister of the Navy. The telegram said that the Japanese Navy would accept the offer of Hitler with gratitude and requested that OSHIMA be asked to convey those thanks to the Fuehrer. And furthermore, the telegram included instructions to me to negotiate with the German Naval authorities with regard to the navigation of the submarines. According to my recollection Hitler was not in Berlin at that time, and so Ambassador OSHIMA called on the Foreign Minister, Ribbentrop, and asked him to convey the thanks of the Japanese Navy to him. According to my recollection this question arose between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA for the first time on this occasion.

Q Have you ever heard the contents of the negotiations between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA on this matter?

A Yes.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

the Vice-Minister of the Navy, when you departed for Berlin. Do you know where the original instructions may have been filed?

THE WITNESS: The instruction was not in writing; it was given to me orally.

THE PRESIDENT: Why do you say they were read to you?

MR. ROBERTS: When you say in your affidavit "they read", you mean from writing?

MR. TAVENNER: If your Honor please, I object to the leading question.

THE PRESIDENT: It is obviously leading. The objection is upheld.

How do you justify that expression in your affidavit, "they read", if they were not in writing? The translation may be at fault. We don't know.

THE MONITOR: Mr. President, the Japanese text does not use the word.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a matter of translation, if the Court please, and this particular phrase should be referred for review.

THE PRESIDENT: My attention is drawn to the fact that before that he says in his affidavit that the Minister's instructions were handed to him. I think we

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

12

13, 14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

ought to invoke Major Moore's assistance.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. I ask that that be referred to Major Moore.

THE WITNESS: I stated that I received the instructions orally. I stated in my affidavit that the instructions were -- it may have carried a different meaning, but I used the words that "it was transmitted to me."

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will leave that for another time.

Cross-examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q On page 4, Section 2 of your affidavit, you refer to the general subject of the military agreement, the military agreement of January 18, 1942. When did the negotiations for that agreement begin?

A I have no definite recollection of date, but it was one or two days after I received the first report of the opening of hostilities on the 8th of December that negotiations were begun, upon receiving a telegram.

Q What preliminary talks had been entered into prior to the breaking out of war, that is, prior to the attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor?

12.5

3

1

2

6

4

8

10

9

11

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

A Before that no telegrams whatsoever were received in connection with such a matter as this.

CROSS

2

1

Q I did not ask you that. I asked you what preliminary talks.

4

A There were no preliminary talks.

6

7

9

Q From whom did you receive a telegram to start negotiations for this agreement?

8

negotiations for this agreement?

A The telegrams were addressed to me, NOMURA,
and Lieutenant-General BANZAI, my Military Attache, from

10

the Minister of the Navy, the Minister of War, the Chief of the Army General Staff and Chief of the Navy General Staff. The instruction was signed jointly by the four

13

12

Naval and Army heads.

instructions in the telegram.

14 15

A I don't remember, but it was one or two days after the opening of hostilities.

What was the date that was received?

17

16

Q Was Ambassador OSHIMA consulted in regard to this matter?

19

20

21

18

A Other than the fact that Ambassador OSHIMA made contacts for the opening of the negotiations, he did nothing, as the negotiations were to be conducted by

22

me, as Naval Attache, and Lieutenant-General BANZAI, with the German Military and Naval authorities, as per

24

25

Q I believe you stated a few moments ago that

Ambassador OSHIMA kept the Navy and Military informed about matters relating to Navy and Military matters, and that you saw copies of the telegrams or other messages relating to such matters at the time they were sent. Is that true?

A Yes, I have seen them.

Q Then did you see the telegram from Ambassador OSHIMA, in which he threatened to resign in the event his views regarding the proposed military pact in 1939 were not carried out?

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess until 1:30.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

NOMURA

naval questions?

Yes, I expressed thanks for the offer of these two submarines.

Q Was Ambassador OSHIMA present during your conference with Ribbentrop?

In my recollection, Ambassador OSHIMA was not present on that occasion.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you repeat that answer? THE PRESIDENT: He does not recollect OSHIMA being present.

MR. TAVENNER: That is all, if the Tribunal please.

> THE PRESIDENT: Counsel SHIMANOUCHI. MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am SHIMANOUCHI. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI:

During the cross-examination by Mr. Prosecutor, referring to the question of the military alliance between Japan and Germany after the outbreak of the Japanese-American war, Mr. Witness, you stated that you asked Ambassador OSHIMA to contact the German authorities concerning this matter -- German military authorities. Why did you request OSHIMA to contact the German authorities when you, NOMURA, and BANZAI had your instructions from the army and navy?

1

2

3 4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

naval questions?

A Yes, I expressed thanks for the offer of these two submarines.

Q Was Ambassador OSHIMA present during your conference with Ribbentrop?

A In my recollection, Ambassador OSHIMA was not present on that occasion.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you repeat that answer?

THE PRESIDENT: He does not recollect OSHIMA
being present.

MR. TAVENNER: That is all, if the Tribunal please.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsel SHIMANOUCHI.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am SHIMANOUCHI.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR . SHIMANOUCHI:

Q During the cross-examination by Mr. Prosecutor, referring to the question of the military alliance between Japan and Germany after the outbreak of the Japanese-American war, Mr. Witness, you stated that you asked Ambassador OSHIMA to contact the German authorities concerning this matter -- German military authorities. Why did you request OSHIMA to contact the German authorities when you, NOMURA, and BANZAI had your instructions from the army and navy?

3

2

5

6

.

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

18

19 20

21

22

24

. 3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19 20

> 21 22

23

25

THE PRESIDENT: Then, defense counsel could not supply him with the materials that we would take any notice of. They are not a source of naval information.

THE INTERPRETER: The witness replied: "I am prepared to answer."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon, you might clear it up.

MR. BRANNON: Yes. The witness used exhibit 3,001 and 3,002 as a basis of his American figures given to him by me and which has been read in part by me today.

THE PRESIDENT: And that came from Washington? MR. BRANNON: That came from Washington. Then, as a basis for the Japanese figures, as I said before, he used prosecution exhibits.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Will you go ahead with your answer?

Then, may I quote from the official document concerning the United States Navy, which I borrowed from the defense?

Is that exhibit 3,001?

Will you give me a clear direction? I seem to confuse the name of the document and the exhibit number.

THE PRESIDENT: Your attack should be direc-

. 3

1

4 5

6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

19 20

18

21 22

23 24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Then, defense counsel could not supply him with the materials that we would take any notice of. They are not a source of naval information.

THE INTERPRETER: The witness replied: "I am prepared to answer."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon, you might clear it up.

MR. BRANNON: Yes. The witness used exhibit 3,001 and 3,002 as a basis of his American figures given to him by me and which has been read in part by me today.

THE PRESIDENT: And that came from Washington? MR. BRANNON: That came from Washington. Then, as a basis for the Japanese figures, as I said before, he used prosecution exhibits.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Will you go ahead with your answer?

Then, may I quote from the official document concerning the United States Navy, which I borrowed from the defense?

Is that exhibit 3,001? Q

Will you give me a clear direction? I seem to confuse the name of the document and the exhibit number.

THE PRESIDENT: Your attack should be direc-

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SHIGERU S A W A D A, called as a witness in behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: MR. BLEWETT: May the witness be shown the affidavit, please, defense document No. 1523? (Whereupon, a document was shown to the witness.) DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BLEWETT: Is that your affidavit? A Yes, it is. But there is one correction I would like to make in the text. You may do so. On page 1 in the English text, the 4th line of paragraph 2, the wording is, "I went, with the permission of the Chief and the approval of the War Minister, to Hongkong." The words "to Hongkong" should be corrected to "at Hongkong." This should be: "I was at Hongkong," instead of "I went to Hongkong." MR. BLEWETT: I offer in evidence defense document No. 1523. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

25

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document

to was marked defense exhibit No. 3013 and re-

(Whereupon, the document above referred

No. 1523 will receive defense exhibit No. 3013.

.10

"With a view to obtaining assistance from various quarters, a councillor system was adopted by this Institute in May or June, 1941; but these councillors were entirely nominal personnel registered only as members.

"We received no direction or suggestion from the accused KIMURA, SUZUKI, or HOSHINO in connection with business of this Institute."

Any questions?

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Quilliam.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY BRIGADIER QUILLIAM:

Q You were the first director, were you not, of the Institute?

A Yes.

Q But for a period before your appointment the accused HOSHINO acted as director, did he not?

A Yes.

Q What appointment did you hold when you were appointed director?

A Do you mean before my appointment?

Q Before your appointment.

A I was Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, and for a short while after that I was attached to Gen-

2

YOSHIO YAMAMOTO, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR . BLEWETT:

Q What is your name and address, please?

A My name is YAMAMOTO, Yoshio. My address, 443, 2-chome, Koenji, Suginami-ku, Tokyo.

Q May the witness be shown defense document No. 1666. Is that your affidavit, and have you signed it?

A It is my affidavit. My signature is on it.

Q Are the contents therein true and correct?

A They are.

MR. BLEWETT: I offer in evidence defense document No. 1666.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, your attention is directed to the middle paragraph on page 3 relating to the number of persons killed on the Petrel. Objection is made to that part of the paragraph beginning with the words, "If it is true..." on the ground that it is an effort to forswear the issues in the case.

3

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

22

24

YOSHIO YAMAMOTO, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR . BLEWETT:

Q What is your name and address, please?

A My name is YAMAMOTO, Yoshio. My address, 443, 2-chome, Koenji, Suginami-ku, Tokyo.

Q May the witness be shown defense document No. 1666. Is that your affidavit, and have you signed it?

A It is my affidavit. My signature is on it.

Q Are the contents therein true and correct?

A They are.

MR. BLEWETT: I offer in evidence defense document No. 1666.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, your attention is directed to the middle paragraph on page 3 relating to the number of persons killed on the Petrel. Objection is made to that part of the paragraph beginning with the words, "If it is true..." on the ground that it is an effort to forswear the issues in the case.

3

2

4

5

6

8

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

3

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

The part of the affidavit that was read just now, does that refer to the documents which were in the custody of the War Ministry?

Yes, they are.

Then do you know in what manner the documents which were in the custody of the General Staff were disposed of?

A Yes, I do.

Will you explain this briefly?

With regard to the documents which were in the custody of the General Staff, I have referred to this in the very last part of my affidavit. Furthermore, the War Ministry and the General Staff occupied the same building, and at the . time the documents were destroyed I was in the garden and I saw this actually being done by the General Staff.

Then is it correct to conclude that all documents which were in the possession of the General Staff were destroyed by -- were burned?

A Yes.

23 24

22

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

Q The part of the affidavit that was read just now, does that refer to the documents which were in the custody of the War Ministry?

A Yes, they are.

Q Then do you know in what manner the documents which were in the custody of the General Staff were disposed of?

A Yes, I do.

Q Will you explain this briefly?

A With regard to the documents which were in the custody of the General Staff, I have referred to this in the very last part of my affidavit. Furthermore, the War Ministry and the General Staff occupied the same building, and at the time the documents were destroyed I was in the garden and I saw this actually being done by the General Staff.

Q Then is it correct to conclude that all documents which were in the possession of the General Staff were destroyed by -- were burned?

A Yes.

24

23

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q How many copies of the Great Diary were made?

11-

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q How many copies of the Great Diary were made?

11-

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. TAVENNER:

Q How many copies of the Great Diary were made?

-

c

11-

ceived in evidence.)

MR. BLEWETT: I shall read exhibit No. 3013, omitting the formal parts:

"1. From October 1939 to November 1940 I served as Vice-Chief of the General Staff under Imperial Prince KAN-IN, then the Chief of the General Staff.

"2. Early settlement of the China Incident was the policy Japan adhered to consistently. After the operations in China began to show a tendency for protraction, I went, with the permission of the Chief and the approval of the War Minister, to Hong Kong"--

THE PRESIDENT: "I was at Hong Kong" is what I think he said. However, go ahead.

MR. BLEWETT: Oh, yes, your Honor. I made the correction but I put it in the wrong place.

conference for peace among the military representatives of Japan and China. This conference, however, ended in vain, and in consequence it became urgently necessary for us to cut off Chungking from North French Indo-China and the Burma Road, both of which were the most important supply routes for Chungking. For this purpose the Japanese Government opened negotiations with the Vichy Rogime and the British Government. As a result

3

1

4

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

they would like to have this document available.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett.

MR. BLEWETT: Defense counsel, sir, have asked me to present this for identification through this witness, if we may.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: There is no objection, if the Tribunal please.

MR. BLEWETT: I ask that the witness be shown the Great Secret Diary for 1931, Volume 1.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION .

BY MR. BLEWETT: (Continued)

Q Is that the original of the Great Diary?

A Yes.

What volume and for what period of time does it cover?

It is Volume 1 of the Diary of 1931. The period covered is very difficult -- would take some time to say offhand here, because the documents are not filed chronologically.

Q What is the volume number?

No. 1. A

24

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, it

MINORU IIMURA, called as a witness in behalf of the defense, being first duly aworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLEWETT:

Q Will you please state your name and your address;

A My name is IIMURA, Jo, (Minoru); address 2-501 Soshigaya, Setagaya-Ku, Tokyo.

MR. BLEWETT: I ask that the witness be shown defense document 164.

(Whereupon, a document was shown to the witness.)

Q I ask you if that is your affidavit and if you signed it at the end?

A As you say.

Q Are the contents therein true and correct?

A They are true and correct.

MR. BLEWETT: I offer in evidence, if the Tribunal please, defense document 164.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 164 will receive defense exhibit number 3030.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3030 and received in evidence.)

4

1

2

3

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

13

12

14 15

16 17

> 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MINORU IIMURA, called as a witness in behalf of the defense, being first duly aworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLEWETT:

Will you please state your name and your address

My name is IIMURA, Jo, (Minoru); address 2-501 Soshigaya, Setagaya-Ku, Tokyo.

MR. BLEWETT: I ask that the witness be shown ' defense document 164.

(Whereupon, a document was shown to the witness.)

I ask you if that is your affidavit and if you signed it at the end?

A As you say.

Q Are the contents therein true and correct?

A They are true and correct.

MR. BLEWETT: I offer in evidence, if the Tribunal please, defense document 164.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 164 will receive defense exhibit number 3030.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3030 and received in evidence.)

10.

MR. FREEMAN: I shall skip paragraph 8 and begin with paragraph 9:

"The feelings of the nation toward POW's cannot be declared to have been cordial. As air raids
became more intensified and as the number of those
who had lost their kin in the war became more numerous,
it was considered that these feelings were more aggravated.

"In consequence, the proper treatment of the POW's by the Army was censured everywhere that the Army was according too good treatment to the POW's. And again POW staffs were looked upon by the nation at large with apathy, and were criticized by them as if they were unpatriotic to the State. There were instanc s that such staffs were disturbed by some of such unthinking people in the execution of their duties in connection with the POW administration.

"The attached shows some examples of such censures and disturbances."

I offer in evidence defense document 2113.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2113

will receive exhibit No. 3116.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

```
THE PRESIDENT: Is the witness required any further
           COLONEL MORNANE: If the Court please, I merely
3 wish to refer the Tribunal to certain parts of the
4 prosecution's evidence with regard to the treatment of
5 prisoners of war in Japan, exhibits 1916 to 1955, at
6 pages 14,197 to 14,261 inclusive; and the evidence of
7 Captax; Chisholm at pages 14,270 to 14,280; and to ex-
8 hibits 2028 to 2033, at pages 14,901 to 14,907.
           MR. FREEMAN: May the witness be excused?
           THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual terms.
10
11
                 (Whereupon, the wtness was excused.)
12
           MR. FREEMAN: Defense documents 2077 and 2172
13
  have been withdrawn.
14
           I next offer in evidence document 2109-A,
15
  which is an excerpt from the "TOKYO Prisoners of War
16
  Internment Camp Monthly Report for March 1943."
17
           THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
18
           CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2109-A
19
  will receive exhibit number 3124.
20
                (Whereupon, the document above referred to was
21
      marked defense exhibit 3124 and received in evidence.)
           MR. FREEMAN: I shall read exhibit 3124:
23
           "1. Ordinary diet.
24
           "The staple food for the captives of non-com-
25
  missioned officers and under were rationed 570 grammes
```

demand of the general public, in order to have prisoners find comfort and hope in this direction so that they may display the maximum ability in their labor."

I next offer in evidence defense document
2109-B, which is an excerpt from the "FUKUOKA War
Prisoners Camp Monthly Report" for June 1944, 'having
to do with the daily diet of war prisoners.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2109
B will receive exhibit number 3125.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked Defense exhibit 3125 and received in evidence.)

MR. FREEMAN: I read exhibit 3125:

"Individual war prisoners under labor, 705
gs. of rice and wheat per head a day;

"Individual war prisoners below the noncommissioned officer free from labour, 570 gs.;

"Individual commissioned officer and similar ranking officer, 390 gs.

"As a general rule, delivery of rice and wheat to all war prisoners is based on at the rate of 705 gs. per head, but is to be adjusted by actually allowing the foregoing rations to each one in accordance with the nature of labour and physical

1 2

3

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

24

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3147 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLEWETT: Before reading the affidavit of this witness, I refer the Tribunal to page 16,800 and 16,801 of the transcript where reference is made to the reception of decorations by the accused and also exhibits 103 to 129 which are the personal records.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, I again tender in evidence defense document 2244, which has now been distributed. This document is a record of the court-martial of three POWs. I desire to read no part of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2244

will receive exhibit No. 3142.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3142 and received in evidence.)

MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, this concludes the subdivision relative to POWs and civilian internees.

Mr. Cunningham will now offer certain documents that he has.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: At the end of the presentation of evidence in the Tripartite Pact material reservation was made for a few witnesses and documents which were not ready for processing at that time. At this time I would like to present the witness SAITO, whose

9

1

2

3

4

5

11

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23 24

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

.25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: Objection is made, if the Tribunal please. This witness is not qualified to answer a question of that type.

THE PRESIDENT: It is a purely hypothetical question. Objection upheld.

MR. LAZARUS: Nevertheless, Mr. President,
this witness had once been Vice Chief of Staff. General
HATA was Commander-in-Chief of the China forces. Surely he would know what the repercussions would be should
a high-ranking officer disobey his superiors in a
matter like this.

THE PRESIDENT: The question is still one for us: Was the order manifestly unlawful according to international law?

MR. LAZARUS: Nevertheless --

THE PRESIDENT: And the consequences in the Japanese army of disobeying an invalid order are beside the point. It wouldn't matter. But it may certainly be taken into account in dealing with sentence. The Japanese army have no authority to validate an order invalid according to international law.

MR. LAZARUS: I am not worrying about that point, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the consequence of

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you think you are going to meet the sweeping charges made against you by reading the individual experiences of a few people? We know that there are tens of thousands of kind-hearted Japanese. We would assume in the army itself, in the navy, in the air force, many Japanese behaved very well but that is not an answer to these charges. Meet the charges made against you and do not try to prove that in other cases where no charges were made

no faults could be found. That is what you are doing.

MR. FREEMAN: I respectfully submit there are men in the dock from the Foreign Office, from the army, and from the navy. They are charged with conspiracy and among other things, crimes against humanity.

Apparently this instruction came from the Foreign Office which certainly shows there was no conspiracy to humiliate people and I know of no way to disprove these charges than from affidavits from the people who were supposed to have been subjected to these indignities.

THE PRESIDENT: I recollect no charge in respect of Mrs. Martin, no evidence about Mrs. Martin, offered by the prosecution.

It is only fair to let you know just what we think of this type of thing so you will be able to

1 2

7 8

Additional evidence of atrocities in the Kwantung Province appear in exhibit 350, transcript of proceedings, page 4648.

The prosecution does not desire to crossexamine this witness.

MR. FREEMAN: I next call the witness OKADA-THE PRESIDENT: This witness is released on
the usual terms.

MR. FREEMAN: I am sorry.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. FREEMAN: I next call the witness OKADA,

Yoshimasa, whose affidavit is defense document 1781.

YOSHIMASA OKADA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FREEMAN: Mr. OKADA, will you please give us your full name and address? My name is OKADA, Yoshimasa, and my present address: 190 Mabashi, 2-chome, Suginami-ku, Tokyo. MR. FREEMAN: May the witness be shown defense document 1781. Is that your affidavit, and have you signed it?

letters at Singapore.

"A I received the letters of thanks from prisoners. But towards the end of 1945 when withdrawing from the camps our trucks encountered enemy and were burned down with all the official and private things. The last letters I got on the occasion of their liberation were snatched off by an unknown soldier along with a black leather purse containing them, when Australian soldiers plundered us at Singapore."

I next tender in evidence a later interrogation of Captain TAMUZI and offer in evidence this excerpt, defense document 2207.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No.

2207 will receive exhibit No. 3088.

(Whereupon, the document above record to was marked defense exhibit No. 3088 and received in evidence.)

MR. FREEMAN: I will read defense exhibit
No. 3088, excerpts from interrogation of TAZUMI 27
May 1947:

"Q Had you any facilities for recreation and comfort for the prisoners in the Rangoon Camps?

"A Yes, athletic meetings for the white people

only were held three times and conerts were held often and some 60 books were given them in two installments.

"Q What was the canteen like in the said camps?

"A Eats, drinks and daily necessities were bought for all of the prisoners from the canteen fund which was their collective fund. Order and distribution of articles was in charge of officers among the prisoners. The paymaster of the camp acted as the agency for finding ordered articles and kept connection with merchants. I forgot the volume of monthly sales.

"Q Did you allow them to rest on such days as Sunday and other holidays in accordance with the regulations?

"A Yes, we did, but since January 1945 the outdoor labor required so many men that all could not rest at once on Surdays and they took rest every day in turns.

"Q Was there unlawful acts inflicted by Japanese soldiers on the prisoners since the middle of September 1944?

"A I don't remember any of the unlawful acts toward the prisoners by Japanese soldiers. But the prisoners were punished.

"Examples:

"1. When some British soldiers refused to go out for labor. (It was reported by the British Chief of the building).

"2. When an Indian officer would not act upon the administrative regulations for the prisoners.

"Q Was there any case in which the prisoners in the said camps were mentally and physically well treated?

"A Yes, there were. The examples are as follows:

- "1. Upon the revision of the prisoners' payroll maximum wage rate was allowed them.
- "2. They had near the camps their own vegetable farms where the products were not only enough for
 then but were oftan bartered for rare foods in the
 militar market.
- "3. They received a lot of cows and pigs which were slaughtered in the camps thereby increasing the supply of raw fresh meat.
- "4. During Christmas and New Year a lot of luxuries were given them.
- "Q Were you a member of the staff of the 73rd Commissary Sector or an M.P?
- "A No. I was not in the staff of the 73rd Commissary Sector, but was in the staff of the Malay

- 100

Prisoners Camp. My branch of arms was artillery."

THE PRESIDENT: I hear that this person,

TAZUMI, had been tried down there as to offenses

relating to prisoners of war. Is he still available?

MR. FREEMAN: He is in Rangoon.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

7 8

I now read into evidence the last page of exhibit 3093, beginning with paragraph 4:

"4. As for the alleged illegal actions of which a charge is laid before the Court, the Army Headquarters never ordered such illegalities to be perpetrated, nor did it receive any reports on the same; in fact, we knew nothing whatever about the cases. Accordingly, General KIMURA, Commander of the Area Army forces, had of course no knowledge whatsoever of those wrongs. - -"

COLONEL MORNANE: If it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this. The witness cannot say whether General KIMURA had any knowledge of these things or not, in his position.

THE PRESIDENT: No, he cannot.

MR. FREEMAN: Is the objection upheld?

THE PRESIDENT: Is that all you object to in this affidavit?

COLONEL MORNANE: If it please the Tribunal, I object to the whole of the part that has been read up to date.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it looks as though we will have to edit it on the Bench. It is full of repetitive material at all events.

COLONEL MORNANE: It is only paragraph 4 my

Duda & Spratt

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I am not objecting to the offering of defense document 1940, but in my objection a moment ago to the last question and answer on page 10 of the present witness' affidavit, I called attention to the fact that the material cited there does not appear in any draft of rule 15 or instruction 15 which appears on the order list. I understood that counsel assured us that this quotation was contained in a document which he would presently present.

THE PRESEDENT: He gave us his word that it was in 1940, and it is not; but he may have had some other document in mind.

MR. TAVENNER: On the basis of this document I desire to renew my objection to the matter appearing on page 10 of the witness' affidavit, and I will withdraw it if he produces a document in compliance with his statement.

MR. ROBERTS: When we read defense document
1940 it will disclose a reference to an annex concerning the policy of the navy. The document
that I referred to as 2294 covers the annex and the
information contained in the affidavit.

I would like to proceed to have

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

that the official document is the English translation. 1 THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean? When you 2 obtained this document from Japanese sources it was in 3 English? MR. TAVENNER: The document was translated by SCAP and is an official record of SCAP. THE PRESIDENT: Not official Japanese, but 7 official as far as the Supreme Commander is concerned. MR. FURNESS: If your Honor please, it is 9 quite obvious that both Baron HARADA and Prince SAIONJI 10 spoke and thought in Japanese and regardless of what 11 SCAP thought, it seems to me that the basic official 12 13 document is in Japanese. THE PRESIDENT: You will have a photostat 14 copy of the original which is the official Japanese 15 16 copy perhaps. 17 Mr. Freeman. 18 MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, I next 19 call the witness KUDO, whose affidavit is defense 20 document 2233. 21 22 23 24

NOTE:

25

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

1 2

4 5

promptly transmitted to the countries concerned.

The Foreign Ministry, having no means of investigation, had to rely upon the information supplied by them and could not do anything further than drawing the attention of the authorities concerned to the necessity of according fair and equitable treatment to the prisoners and internees of enemy countries, especially taking into consideration the residence of Japanese in enemy countries.

"Such being the circumstances, nothing was known to us with respect to the ill-treatment of prisoners of war or internees in the occupied areas unless we were informed by the military or naval authorities concerned or by the adversary belligerent countries. As to the prisoners and internees on Wake Island, we received some inquiries from the Swiss Minister in Tokyo in the beginning of 1942, but they were inquiries about conditions and not protests or complaints, and we did not fail in transmitting them to the authorities concerned, and upon receipt of reply from them, we immediately sent the information obtained at that time to the Swiss Minister, as shown in exhibit 2034, and a further communication was made to him on 10 August (exhibit 2040). It was not

2

. 3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Mornane.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY COLONEL MORNANE:

- Q Witness, I take it you ceased to have any connection with these matters on the 31st of October, 1942?
 - A Yes, that is so.
- Q Well, now, with regard to complaints received prior to that time, to what ministries, or other offices did you send them?
- A Such matters were referred to the Second Section of the Bureau of Treaties, and from that section it was transmitted to the office handling matters relating to Japanese nationals in enemy countries presided over by Minister SUZUKI.
- Q You would not send them direct to the War Ministry from the Foreign Office?
 - A No.
- Q Have you any knowledge of how Minister SUZUKI dealt with them?
- A He handled quite a good deal of business, but I do not know the extent.
- Q But, have you any knowledge as to what particular ministries he would send the complaint?
 - A I do not know, because when I was transferred

in which both articles of the Hague and the Geneva Convention appear. However, I attempted yesterday in reading excerpts from both to show that difference. I will be glad later to bring it back in and show the difference.

THE PRESIDENT: It is the purpose of tendering this document that I am inquiring about, and I
state that you have to note the differences between
the two conventions and see whether they justify this
document.

MR. FREEMAN: This document was offered to show the Navy's reason why they objected to the ratification of the Geneva Convention. I think it also shows the lack of conspiracy among the accused.

I next offer in evidence defense document 2126, which is the Army's reply relative to ratifying the same Convention.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2126

will receive exhibit No. 3044.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3044 and received in evidence.)

MR. FREEMAN: I shall not read exhibit 3044 but comment to the extent that the army was agreeable

by General TERAUCHI's army.

MR. FREFMAN: If the Tribunal pleases, that still is outside the scope of this affidavit. The affidavit concerns certain instructions given by Marshal TIRAUCHI on November 20, 1941. What happened thereafter has nothing to do with this affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Two opposite views are open.

This witness actually says no more than TERAUCHI

made that speech, but there is another view and

perhaps the sounder one, that the sincerity of that

speech can be the subject of cross-examination.

I do not know what views my colleagues may have; I

have only one.

By a majority the objection is upheld, and the question disallowed.

COLONEL MORNANE: If it please the Court.

MR. FREINAN: May the witness be excused?

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

I next offer in evidence defense document 1589 which is an amendment to Article 2 of the regulations concerning the treatment of prisoners of war.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1589

will receive exhibit No. 3046.

(3)

the accommodation, handling, allowances, transfer, labor and punishment of prisoners of war and internees at the front.

- "(b) Matters concerning correspondence of the prisoners of war and internees at the front.
- "(c) Matters concerning the relief of prisoners of war and internees at the front.
- "(d) Matters of minor importance concerning granting to foreigners entree of prisoners of war camps and the military detention houses."

COLONEL MORNANE: If it please the Tribunal, with regard to that the prosecution would like to be informed as to who is referred to by the title of Adjutant. Is it the Adjutant of the Prisoner of War Control Bureau?

THE PRESIDENT: The certificate throws no light on it, but it is suggested, probably quite rightly, that it means the War Ministry Adjutant.

It is nearly twelve. Clear it up during the luncheon adjournment.

We will adjourn until half-past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

's

subject matters that I would like to open up very shortly which are not covered by other evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: I realize his importance.

He was in charge of a camp, or camps, in Tokyo where the accused, or most of them, I suppose, resided.

Those camps may or may not have been under the eye of some of the accused. I realize the importance of it, but I do not see the value of a cross-examination along these lines where you are relying on your own evidence independently of his answers.

I am not suggesting for one minute that any of your questions was really inadmissible, but you were right on the border line all the time.

COLONEL MORNANE: There is one matter, if it please the Tribunal, I would like to bring out, which has not already been proved. That is, that the accuse TOJO is alleged to have visited one of the camps under his control during his regime there.

THE PRESIDENT: I have not prevented you from asking any questions. I am suggesting a certain course to you. Use your own judgment.

MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, that is the last paragraph in the affidavit. He states that TOJO visited --

THE PRESIDENT: It didn't escape our attentio

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: If there is no other re-crossexamination, may the witness be excused?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual terms.

> (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) MR. FREEMAN: I next call the witness YAMAZAKI,

Shigeru, whose affidavit is defense document 1696.

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

	SHIGERU YAMAZAKI, recalled as a wit-
1	ness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand
2	and testified through Japanese interpreters as
3	follows:
4	THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former oa
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. FREEMAN:
7	
8	Q Will you give us your full name and address?
9	A My name is YAMAZAKI, Shigeru; my address,
10	Uwabori, Kamikawa-Mura, Chiisagata-Gori, Nagano Prefect-
11	ure.
12	MR. FREEMAN: Will the Translation Section
13	repeat the President of the Court's statement to the
14	witness?
5	(Whereupon, the Japanese interpreter
6	addressed the witness in Japanese.)
7	MR. FREEMAN: May the witness be shown defense
8	document 1696?
9	(Whereupon, a document was handed to
20	the witness.)
21	BY MR. FREEMAN:
22	Q Is that your affidavit and have you signed it?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Are the contents true and correct?
25	A Yes, correct.

SHIGERU YAMAZAKI, recalled as a wit-1 ness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand 2 and testified through Japanese interpreters as . 3 follows: 4 THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former oat 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. FREEMAN: Will you give us your full name and address? 8 My name is YAMAZAKI, Shigeru; my address, Uwabori, Kamikawa-Mura, Chiisagata-Gori, Nagano Prefect-10 ure. 11 MR. FREEMAN: Will the Translation Section 12 repeat the President of the Court's statement to the 13 witness? 14 (Whereupon, the Japanese interpreter 15 addressed the witness in Japanese.) 16 MR. FREEMAN: May the witness be shown defense 17 document 1696? 18 19 (Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.) 21 BY MR. FREEMAN: 22 Is that your affidavit and have you signed it? 23 Yes. A 24 Are the contents true and correct? Q 25 Yes, correct. A

BY MR. FREEMAN (Continued)

Q Mr. Yamazaki, did you attend the meetings of the commandants of prisoner of war camps on June 25, 1942 and July 7, 1942?

A Yes.

Q Did Lieutenant-General KAMIMURA read some instructions on those dates?

A He read the instructions of the War Minister as proxy.

Q Can you briefly give us the substance of those instructions?

A Prisoners of war must be handled with justice.

Do not pamper them. Do not let them eat the bread of idleness. And finally, in handling the prisoners, efforts should be made to demonstrate to the natives of the area the superiority of the Japanese.

MR. FREEMAN: You may cross-examine.

BY MR. FREEMAN (Continued)

Q Mr. Yamazaki, did you attend the meetings of the commandants of prisoner of war camps on June 25, 1942 and July 7, 1942?

A Yes.

Q Did Lieutenant-General KAMIMURA read some instructions on those dates?

A He read the instructions of the War Minister as proxy.

Q Can you briefly give us the substance of those instructions?

A Prisoners of war must be handled with justice. Do not pamper them. Do not let them eat the bread of idleness. And finally, in handling the prisoners, efforts should be made to demonstrate to the natives of the area the superiority of the Japanese.

MR. FREEMAN: You may cross-examine.

bunal please, on the ground of lack of relevancy and materiality.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I should like to state my opinion as a counsel for MUTO.

THE PRESIDENT: Do, but do not waste our time.
MR. S. OKAMOTO: I shall respect time.

This has a very important bearing to prove the fact that at headquarters -- that the headquarters was not expecting the outbreak of atrocities, and that they also did their best to prevent the outbreak of atrocities. That can be absolutely given in the short time of five or six minutes, and it will take only fifteen minutes to put all my questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, we don't want to be coaxed into allowing you to ask questions that are not really relevant or material. Questions of what was General YAMASHITA's policy are quite vague and not allowable. Try again.

Q What was the strategy entertained by Ceneral YAMASHITA in the area around Manila at the time immediately after the landing of the United States forces or Mindanao Island on the 19th of November --

THE MONITOR: 15th of December, 1944.

THE PRESIDENT: We don't want to know the

1 2

7 8

as much raw materials as possible from the city, and later to carry on the fighting chiefly in the mountainous area -- in the triangular mountainous area?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: Objection is made on the ground of its being a leading question.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: As I am afraid of putting this type of question which would be considered as a leading question, I put my first question, that is, concerning the policy of the General, and your Honor stated my question was too vague.

THE PRESIDENT: It is not objectionable only because it is leading; it is objectionable because it is indefinite.

Objection upheld.

Who is the American counsel appearing in the same interest as you?

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Mr. Cole.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps he can assist.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I will put another ques-

tion.

Did you, Mr. Witness, express some opinion concerning strategy or operations to General YAMASHIT. around about the 20th -- the 10th of February, 1945?

Yes, I did

. 3

1

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

> 15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

as much raw materials as possible from the city, and later to carry on the fighting chiefly in the mountainoug area -- in the triangular mountainous area?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: Objection is made on the ground of its being a leading question.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: As I am afraid of putting this type of question which would be considered as a leading question, I put my first question, that is, concerning the policy of the General, and your Honor stated my question was too vague.

THE PRESIDENT: It is not objectionable only because it is leading; it is objectionable because it is indefinite.

Objection upheld.

Who is the American counsel appearing in the same interest as you?

MR. S. OKAMOTO: Mr. Cole.

THE PRESIDENT: Perhaps he can assist.

MR. S. OKAMOTO: I will put another ques-

tion.

Did you, Mr. Witness, express some opinion concerning strategy or operations to General YAMASHIT. around about the 20th -- the 10th of February, 1945?

Yes, I did

. 3

1

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

1 MR. FREEMAN: I next call the witness, ICHIDA, Jiro, whose affidavit is defense document 284. 3 JIRC ICHIDA, called as a witness on behalf 5 of the defense, being first duly sworn, testi-6 fied through Japanese interpreters as follows: 7 . DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. FREEMAN: 9 Mr. ICHIDA, will you give us your full name 10 and address. 11 My name is ICHIDA, Jiro; my address, Showa-12 dori, Nakama-machi, Onga-gun, Fukuoka-ken. 13 MR. FREEMAN; May the witness see defense 14 document 284. 15 (Whereupon, a document was handed 16 17 to the witness.) Is that your affidavit, and have you signed it! 18 19 Λ Yos. 20 Are the contents therein true and correct? 0 21 Λ Yos. 22 MR. FREEMAN: I offer in ovidence defense 23 document 284. 24 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 25 CLERK CF THE COURT: Defens locument 284

TE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

2

. 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, we present the following language corrections.

Exhibit 2234, record page 16,029, line 4, delete "to my friends" and substitute ", (comma) following the advice of my colleagues, (comma)"; delete "various."

Line 5, substitute "at various places" for "all over the country."

Line 16, delete from "such" to "ridiculed" and substitute "I was made fun of."

THE PRESIDENT: In chambers counsel for the accused ARAKI applied for subpoenae for certain witnesses, twenty-four in all. For the time being, subpoenae will not be issued. I understand from Mr. Mc-Manus, counsel for the accused, that affidavits have been obtained from those witnesses. Those affidavits can be tendered in the ordinary way and will be dealt with on their merits. If the witness in any case is required for examination or cross-examination, then his attendance will be directed, and if necessary,

23

24

ment. Generally, it states that Archbishop Marella was allowed to visit certain camps in Japan and certain of his priests were allowed to visit these camps for the purpose of providing religious consolation. It goes on to say, or he goes on to say they did not have "either the right or the duty to see to the observation of international conventions or to protest in the event of their contravention."

He says nothing as to the conditions of the camps that he visited, but he does say there were cases where prisoners praised efforts of overseers to make their lives less hard. No allegation has been made that prisoners of war were denied religious consolation in Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: He suggests there were. He suggests that the priests more often presided at funerals than assisted at dying.

THE PRESIDENT: And he says that is the Japanese mentality. Anyhow, you are making no allegation even if he does.

LIEUT. COLONEL MORNANE: There is no allegation in the prosecution's case. That is, we haven't proved anything.

Now, specifically, we object, on the second

. 9

)

-

Question by Mr. Blakeney: "Now, am I to understand that for motives of your own you did make to Mr. Woodhead substantially the sta ment I have put to you?"

Answer: "Yes. I was asked to say that by ITAGAKI. I had no other way."

THE PRESIDENT: This affidavit of Woodhead, if admitted, may show that ITAGAKI was not mentioned at the time to Woodhead, and what he said about ITAGAKI in the box was an afterthought and not mentioned to Woodhead.

MR. TAVENNER: That would seem not to go to the point as the only point involved is whether or not he made the statements that were presented in the course of cross-examination.

The second objection is that the witness is not available for cross-examination e n if it were permissible to introduce this affidavit. In addition to all of that, the affidavit goes far beyond the two questions that were involved in the cross-examination.

MR. BLAKENEY: Before replying to the specific objections, I should like to mention that at the time the defense Russian evidence was being presented, I offered in evidence the book itself from

,

Question by Mr. Blakeney: "Now, am I to understand that for motives of your own you did make to Mr. Woodhead substantially the sta ment I have put to you?"

Answer: "Yes. I was asked to say that by ITAGAKI. I had no other way."

THE PRESIDENT: This affidavit of Woodhead, if admitted, may show that ITAGAKI was not mentioned at the time to Woodhead, and what he said about ITAGAKI in the box was an afterthought and not mentioned to Woodhead.

MR. TAVENNER: That would seem not to go to the point as the only point involved is whether or not he made the statements that were presented in the course of cross-examination.

The second objection is that the witness is not available for cross-examination e n if it were permissible to introduce this affidavit. In addition to all of that, the affidavit goes far beyond the two questions that were involved in the cross-examination.

MR. BLAKENEY: Before replying to the specific objections, I should like to mention that at the time the defense Russian evidence was being presented, I offered in evidence the book itself from Wolf & Lefle

Page 1, paragraph 13 of the affidavit, the sentence beginning "As the War Minister" down to "diplomatic matters:" exhibit 1104, page 10,081; exhibit 2219, page 15,841; exhibit 2218, page 15,837; exhibit 2216, page 15,832.

Again, page 17, paragraph beginning "As for the problems" down to "independence:" exhibit 1104, page 10,081.

Same page, paragraph beginning "These explanations" down to "Nations: same exhibit.

Page 19 -- I am not quite sure in which of the sections on this page that part is. It is either the end of 13 or the beginning of 14 -- paragraph beginning "Standing from the League" down to "witnesses:" exhibit 2222, page 15,845.

Page 20, section 14-A, paragraph beginning "To cope with this" down to "Soviet Union:" exhibit 668, page 7,332; exhibit 670, page 7,331.

Page 20 again, second section,
paragraph beginning "I do not admit" down to "expression:" exhibit 746, page 7,720; exhibit 747, page 7,727; exhibit 671-A, page 7,336;
I beg your pardon -- page 35, section 24, paragraph beginning "My duty as Education Minister" down to "meeting:" exhibits 2218, page 15,837; 2219, page

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

charged with having undertaken official acts in connection with these negotiations in furtherance of the charge leveled by the prosecution. While admittedly this document is dated prior to the time Mr. HIROTA was in office as Foreign Minister, nevertheless it is only a question of a few months antecedent thereto, and after he assumed office these negotiations were continued. In the light of the fact that there appears to be a charge of continuing conspiracy, in our submission this document is relevant and material as showing whether or not the negotiations were forced upon the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

"Collection of the Publications in Connection with the Negotiation for the Purchase of North Manchuria Railway" will receive exhibit No. 3235 for identification only; the excerpt therefrom, being defense document 2509, will receive exhibit No. 3235-A.

(Whereupon, the pamphlet above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3235 for identification only; the excerpt therefrom, being defense document

upon Japan's position in refusing the invitation to the

Brussels Conference, a point upon which the prosecution relies in support of their case; and I may add I believe later proof by other witnesses will show that the HIROTA Government did rely upon this extract.

Now, specifically as to the relevancy of a document of this nature, it would seem to me that it is not unusual to introduce into evidence hearings before committees regarding legislation pending before, let us say, a legislature, in order that the proper interpretation can be given to the terms of a piece of legislation or, a treaty; and whereas here Japan relied upon this proof in order to refuse the invitation to the conference, it would seem, in our submission, to have very definite probative value and relevancy.

It further goes to the point of whether or not there was a violation by Japan in refusing to attend that conference.

As to the further point, if your Honors please, as to whether or not this was a matter that should have been presented in the general phase, I wish to state in the individual case of the accused HIROTA, since he was on of the principal dramatis personae, the fact that evidence on his behalf may be intertwined with matters pertaining to the general phases is something which is inherent in

6

7

8 9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

21

22 23

24

HORINOUCHI 29,717

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: The accused TOGO will be absent for the first half of the morning session, and the accused KAYA will be absent for the whole of the morning session, from the courtroom, conferring with their counsel.

Mr. Yamaoka.

KENSUKE HORINOUCHI, called as a
witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the
stand and testified through Japanese interpreters
as follows:

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, just before the close of the day yesterday the Tribunal made a ruling on hearsay. I find that for my purposes it will not be necessary to press these questions regarding the conversations between this witness and the accused HIROTA, at this time.

THE PRESIDENT: It may never be necessary to decide that point. We will wait until it is necessary.

MR. YAMAOKA: I should be satisfied, if the Tribunal please, if this witness, however, is permitted to testify to the actual conversations that he attended and also to the onversations that he held with

1 2

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, as this witness has been cross-examined at great length by my learned friend on some documents about which there is some dispute as to authenticity, I respectfully request that the documents so tendered to this witness and not identified by him and subsequently not admitted into evidence, that is, those which the prosecution has withdrawn, be submitted for identification.

MR. COMYNS CARR: In my submission, the defense cannot have it both ways. They cannot both have the document excluded from evidence, because their witness won't identify them, and at the same time have them marked for identification. This point was discussed a long time ago in this Tribunal and the Tribunal ruled the other way.

THE PRESIDENT: Although we do not do this in a national court, at least not in my court in Australia, I think we have been doing something of the kind here.

I am not sure about it. I am subject to correction.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in this precise form I do not think it has arisen before.

THE PRESIDENT: They are not received into evidence by being marked for identification. If it is any comfort to the defense I think we would prefer that

great respect I submit that the witness has so answered

3

4

1

2

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

19 20

18

21 22

23

24 25

already when he was being questioned on this document.

THE PRESIDENT: He has stated certain things, but he has suspended his judgment until he reads that document. He said so.

Have you finished?

I have finished reading.

Now, then, cannot you tell me whether that is the correct copy filed in the Foreign Office records of the decisions of that cabinet meeting?

This is not in the original form as decided at the cabinet. But I do recognize that it is a copy of those decisions.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I ask that it be admitted in evidence, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If your Honors please, I object to this document's being a proper piece of evidence in the case at this stage of the proceedings. I respectfully submit that the prosecution has already closed its case, and that is not proper evidence in the nature of impeachment of this witness' testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: You can always get in evidence relevant to the issue or relevant to facts in issue in this way in cross-examination of the witnesses for

7 8

to appear as his American counsel <u>pro hac vice</u> for the purpose of presenting the evidence which has been prepared by his other counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not quite follow. What are you going to do for HIROTA? What will you fail to do that his former counsel would have done? Are you going to offer his evidence? Are you going to call his witnesses?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You are going to cross-examine or examine them in chief? Are you going to re-examine them? You are going to take his objections?

MR. YAMAOKA: I intend to do that, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: And you are going to sum up,

are you?

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, that has not yet -- I only intend to present his evidence at the present time; and during the course of it, the witnesses naturally will be called and his other evidence, documentary evidence, will be tendered. If objections are necessary I intend to take them.

THE PRESIDENT: For the time being, so far as we can judge HIROTA has the assistance of American counsel.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

to appear as his American counsel <u>pro hac vice</u> for the purpose of presenting the evidence which has been prepared by his other counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not quite follow. What are you going to do for HIROTA? What will you fail to do that his former counsel would have done? Are you going to offer his evidence? Are you going to call his witnesses?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You are going to cross-examine or examine them in chief? Are you going to re-examine them? You are going to take his objections?

MR. YAMAOKA: I intend to do that, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: And you are going to sum up,

are you?

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, that has not yet -- I only intend to present his evidence at the present time; and during the course of it, the witnesses naturally will be called and his other evidence, documentary evidence, will be tendered. If objections are necessary I intend to take them.

THE PRESIDENT: For the time being, so far as we can judge HIROTA has the assistance of American counsel.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

```
1
    15,841; 271, page 3,640; 1291, page 11,695; 491,
2
    page 6037.
3
 4
 5
 6
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, 3 it is true that Mr. HIROTA was not in office from 4 February to June 1937, but I submit that this is only 5 a brief period of a few months. Thereafter he con-6 tinued in office until 1938, in May, during the First 7 KONOYE Cabinet. During his absence from office things 8 did transpire in China, and unless that story is told, we respectfully submit, a true picture -- that is, a satisfactory picture -- cannot be evolved.

The testimony of this witness is primarily concerned with conditions in China; not in Tokyo 13 but in China, as of that period. I respectfully submit that the events which there occurred did affect the actions of the Japanese Government, and particularly the accused HIROTA.

Now, in respect to paragraph 4, I do not believe that this is mere gossip. The witness clearly states that he was told by persons living there the situation here.

20 21

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

possible instructions had gone out from General Headquarters to be handed down to all Commanders in China
to the effect that these depredations must cease and
that Major General HOMMA had been sent to Nanking to
investigate and to ensure compliance. HIROTA said
that he confidentially expects the immediate cessation
of such looting. He furthermore authorized me to
inform you that in the light of the investigations
now being carried out full indemnification will be
made for losses and damages inflicted."

At this point, if the Tribunal please, I desire to invite the attention of the Tribunal to exhibit 972-G, record 9,521. This was the last principle address by Mr. HIROTA in the Diet on January 22, 1938.

Only a part of it was read into the record, and while I do not propose to read the balance at the present time, I do desire to state that we intend to rely on the entire speech.

We offer in evidence defense document 2157. This is an answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA before the House of Representatives Committee on the Budget at the 73rd session of the Imperial Diet on January 29, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

know whether it is necessary to remind the Tribunal that, of course, similar documents in the case of ARAKI were rejected by the Court.

> MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please --THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: While it is true that this statement was made by Count UCHIDA while Mr. HIROTA was not in office, nevertheless, we believe it is relevant in showing that the policy of Japan, that is, the policy of the Japanese Government as to the Non-Aggression Pact, had already been decided by the previous government. Consequently, the attitude and actions taken by the accused HIROTA subsequently concerning this were not matters of his own choosing.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: I desire to call the witness 18 KAMEYAMA, Kazuji.

19

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

20

21 22

23

24

MR. T. OKAMOTO: I should like to conduct additional direct examination on behalf of the accused MINAMI.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. T. OKAMOTO:

Q Mr. Witness, in your affidavit, pages 29 to 31 in the English text and pages 42 to 44 in the Japanese, you stated that on March 9, 1932, you invited Colonel NAGATA, Tesuzan, then Chief of the Military Administration Section of the War Ministry, to your house and heard from him the explanation of the so-called March Incident and the October Incident.

Now, Mr. Witness, was Colonel NAGATA connected with the March and October incidents, or did he take a position opposing them?

A I think that he stood opposed to those incidents.

Q Mr. Witness, did you or did you not place trust in Colonel NAGATA's explanation?

A I listened to him with confidence in his explanation.

Q Mr. "itness, in your affidavit you frequently use the words "machinations of militarists and plots."

Now, I ask you, did you or did you not obtain at that time, that is, in 1931, any information that

2

1

5

4

8

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

22

24

BY MR. ROBERTS:

25

P

1	War Minister MINAMI participated in such machinations
2	or plots?
3	THE INTERPRETER: The witness' reply, "He
4	did not."
5	Q Have you at any time after 1931 received
6	information that MINAMI, as an army officer or as an
7	ordinary civilian, participated in what you call
8	machinations or plots?
9	A I have never received such information.
0	MR. T. OKAMOTO: Thank you. That is all, sir
1	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lazerus.
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
.3	BY MR. LAZARUS:
4	Q Marquis KIDO, in your affidavit you refer
5	to the militarists and the fact that you consistently
6	fought them and opposed them. Do you include General
17	HATA in this category?
18	A I do not include General HATA.
19	MR. LAZARUS: That is all. Thank you.
20	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.
21	MR. ROBERTS: Examination on behalf of the
22	defendant OKA.
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)
24	

Marquis KIDO, on page 134 of your affidavit,

you refer to some information received from your
Chief Secretary MATSUDAIRA, and contained in prosecution exhibit 1115. It is stated in exhibit 1115,
which is an entry on July 15, 1941, the second sentence -I will read just two sentences:

"There still remained a certain vagueness about Foreign Minister MATSUOKA's attitude towards the proposal formula for a Japan-American understanding. Under the circumstances, up to yesterday the Premier was of the opinion that should the Foreign Minister agree to the formula prepared by the Director of Military Affairs and the Director of Naval Affairs, with a few alterations he would push the policy as it was."

Were you referring to the original formula for the American-Japanese negotiations, Marquis?

A Having had no connection with this matter, I do not know the details. However, it is my understanding that some revisions were contemplated on the original formula.

- Q What was the approximate date of the original formula?
 - A I don't know which was the original formula.
- Q Would that be in April when the negotiations were begun, '41?

ever coming to fruition in the light of the situation 1 then existing, and, secondly, because full confidence and trust could not be placed in the person who was 3 to act as a mediating agent. The word "Government" was now used and perhaps this was my fault, but I 5 should have said "a part or section of the Government."

- Was that the only reason?
- That is all in my understanding.
- You go on in the next sentence and say "But Prime Minister KOISO was very enthusiastic and proceeded to the palace and reported to the Throne on his plan for direct peace negotiation ... "

Were you present when he did this?

- A No.
- You were not present? 0
- I was not present.
- How did you learn of it?
- I heard of this later from His Majesty. A
- Why was he making direct peace negotiations at this time rather than going through his Foreign Minister? Was it because he was being opposed?
- I am unfamiliar with such internal matters of the Government.
- Wasn't this enthusiasm of KOISO for peace also called to the attention of the Throne by other members

2

7

8

1

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

Q Was it not part of the duty of the responsible ministers of state to carry out these national policies already decided upon?

A Yes, that is so.

Q With reference to paragraph 39 in your affidavit, in that paragraph you refer to a letter sent to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal at that time, Lord MAKINO, the day following the so-called May 15th Incident?

A Yes.

Q In that letter you make certain reference, certain opinions to politics. Now, was the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal in a position to carry out such political matters, was it within his right to carry out such matters?

A This was at a time when an unusual incident broke out and the cabinet as a consequence collapsed, and this was submitted as advice with reference to what policies the succeeding cabinet should undertake to carry out. That, of course, was within his authority to do.

Q Is it not true that at that time Prince SAIONJI, the Elder Statesman, was still living, and in decisions concerning the formation of a cabinet the Elder Statesman was consulted, and not the Lord

.

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24.

2

,

5

6

7 8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

> 19 20

18

21

23

24

expenditures showed some increase from year to year.

Q How much is "some increase"?

A I am afraid I don't remember the extent of the increase.

Q But you are quite sure there was an increase over 1938 in 1939 and subsequent years?

A Yes, I do know that.

Q Prices of other things in general rose during those years too, did they not?

A I believe they did.

Q Well, now, Mr. Witness, to shorten this, don't you know for a fact that the passage of the National Service Law in 1939 did not contemplate nor import any insrease in the size of the armed forces of the Manchukuo Government, but represented merely an effort to consolidate and rationalize the pre-existing military forces of and in the country?

colonel IVANOV: If your Honor please, the witness has already replied that in 1939 he was not in
Manchuria, and the information that he has already given
to the questions asked by the defense do cover the
matter.

MR. BLAKENEY: I don't think this witness requires any assistance whatever from counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: He did profess to have some

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

9

11

13

14

16 17

18 19

20

23

22

24

used Manchukuo resources for that purpose. From 1935 through 1938 I stayed in Manchuria holding the offices of Chief of the Administrative Section and then of Chief of the Kwantung Territory Bureau."

DIRECT

Signed, "TAKEBE, Rekuzo."

The defense may cross-exemine witness TAKEBE, Rekuzo.

MR. BLAKENEY: If permitted, I should like before commencing, to make a statement of our position.

THE PRESIDENT: This Court -- I do not know what you have to say, Major Blakeney, but don't bring up that matter we have just closed.

MR. BLAKENEY: I don't think I have ever brought up a matter that has been closed, so far as I know. I have no desire to do so now.

cally object to the defense making preliminary statements as the prosecution has made no such statements.

THE PRESIDENT: We must hear what Major Blakeney is going to say.

MR. BLAKENEY: Language Section, this is paper No. 1.

In connection with the tender by the Soviet prosecution of five witnesses for cross-examination, I should like to call the attention of the Tribunal to one

time the rule was that only one counsel could examine.

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid we are all

against you, Captain Brooks. The objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. BROOKS: May I further examine this witness then, your Honor, as to the falsity of the affidavit which you have on record, which does not have a proper certificate.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no finding on the value of the certificate by the Tribunal, which alone makes findings. The grounds for excluding the further affidavit, or the affidavit, are also the grounds for not hearing him further.

MR. BROOKS: I ask the Court then to consider a motion to strike the exhibit, 158, since we have the witness on the stand, who says it is not his affidavit and that it is not correct, and I am willing to prove it.

THE PRESIDENT: The application is refused.

MR. BROOKS: I understand you have no further use for this witness then?

THE PRESIDENT: None. The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
MR. BROCKS: I would like to have for the

4 5

time the rule was that only one counsel could examine.

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid we are all
against you, Captain Brooks. The objection is upheld
and the document rejected.

MB. BROOKS: May I further examine this

MR. BROOKS: May I further examine this witness then, your Honor, as to the falsity of the affidavit which you have on record, which does not have a proper certificate.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no finding on the value of the certificate by the Tribunal, which alone makes findings. The grounds for excluding the further affidavit, or the affidavit, are also the grounds for not hearing him further.

MR. BROOKS: I ask the Court then to consider a motion to strike the exhibit, 158, since we have the witness on the stand, who says it is not his affidavit and that it is not correct, and I am willing to prove it.

THE PRESIDENT: The application is refused.

MR. BROOKS: I understand you have no further use for this witness then?

THE PRESIDENT: None. The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
MR. BROOKS: I would like to have for the

4 5

7.

32,481

cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: He said he read it in English and that the statements in English were true. What more do we want? And he was cross-examined fully.

MR. BROOKS: That is explained in the present affidavit being offered, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Anyway, he also heard the Japanese translation of what was read in court in English. as I am reminded.

MR. BROOKS: And that explains his answers on cross-examination which are diametrically opposed to everything in the other affidavit, your Honor, and in the affidavit I am offering--

THE PRESIDENT: You can rely on that crossexamination. There is really no occasion for a fresh affidavit. No Member of the Court thinks so, at all events.

MR. BROOKS: If the Court please, I would like to be heard further on that because of the reason of an objection being made at the time that we could not -- the Japanese counsel who was cross-examining could not understand what questions to ask the witness because he couldn't read the English and I was foreclosed from examining because at that

MR. BROOKS: 23, Language Section.

Now the defense would like to call

KATAKURA, Tadashi as a witness.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Wasn't this one of the witnesses the prosecution isn't going to cross-examine?

MR. BROOKS: I have some additional documents
I wish to present.

This witness has been previously sworn.

TADASHI KATAKURA, recalled as a
witness in behalf of the defense, having been
previously sworn, testified through Japanese
interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

Q State your name and address.

A My name is KATAKURA, Tadashi. My present address is No. 2658, Kami-meguro-gochome, Meguro-ku, Tokyo.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I want to remind you, Witness, that you are still under oath.

MR. BROOKS: I ask that defense document 2047 be shown to the witness.

(Whereupon, a document was shown to the witness.)

,

0

13 14

2

3

4

5

. 6

7

9

10

11

12

15

17

18

20

22

24

KATAKURA

Is that your affidavit?

Yes.

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

0

telegram?

A This air force did not go into Manchuria directly.

Q Where did they go?

A When the air force arrived at Shingishu there was inclement weather and also a breakdown in aircraft; that the air force withdrew to Shingishu and to other bases in the rear.

Q When did they advance to Manchuria?

A About two or three days later.

Q Was that without Imperial sanction also?

A At that time there was an Imperial Order sanctioning it.

Q That happened after the 22nd of September?

A Yes.

MR. WOOLWORTH: I have no further questions.

MR. BROOKS: May the witness be excused?

ACTING PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will now take a recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

25

22

DIRECT

1	MR. WOOLWORTH: No cross-examination of this					
2	witness, if the Tribunal please.					
3	MR. BROOKS: May the witness be excused on					
4	the usual terms?					
5	ACTING FRESIDENT: He is excused accord-					
6	ingly.					
7	(Whereupon the witness was excused.)					
8	MR. BROOKS: The defense requests that					
9	KODAMA, Tomeo be called as the next witness.					
0.	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the					
1	witness KODAMA, Tomeo is in court. He has previously					
2	testified before the Tribunal.					
3						
4						
5	behalf of the defense, testified through					
16	Japanese interpreters as follows:					
17	ACTING PRESIDENT: You are warned that you					
18	are still under oath, Witness.					
19	BY MR. BROOKS:					
20	Q Mr. Witness, have you ever testified in this					
21	court before?					
22	A No, I have not.					
23	MR. BROOKS: I didn't think he had, your					
24	Honor.					
25	(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)					

MR. WOOLWORTH: No cross-examination of this witness, if the Tribunal please. MR. BROOKS: May the witness be excused on the usual terms? ACTING FRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. (Whereupon the witness was excused.) 7 8 MR. BROOKS: The defense requests that KODAMA, Tomeo be called as the next witness. 10 MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the witness KODAMA, Tomeo is in court. He has previously 12 testified before the Tribunal. 13 KODAMA, called as a witness on TOMEO behalf of the defense, testified through 15 Japanese interpreters as follows: 16 17 ACTING PRESIDENT: You are warned that you 18 are still under oath, Witness. BY MR. BROOKS: 19 20 Mr. Witness, have you ever testified in this 21 court before? 22 No, I have not. 23 MR. BROOKS: I didn't think he had, your 24 Honor. 25 (Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)

MR. WOOLWORTH: No cross-examination of this					
witness, if the Tribunal please.					
MR. BROOKS: May the witness be excused on					
the usual terms?					
ACTING FRESIDENT: He is excused accord-					
ingly.					
(Whereupon the witness was excused.)					
MR. BROOKS: The defense requests that					
KODAMA, Tomeo be called as the next witness.					
MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the					
witness KODAMA, Tomeo is in court. He has previously					
testified before the Tribunal.					
TOMEO KODAMA, called as a witness on					
behalf of the defense, testified through					
Japanese interpreters as follows:					
ACTING PRESIDENT: You are warned that you					
are still under oath, Witness.					
BY MR. BROOKS:					
Q Mr. Witness, have you ever testified in this					
court before?					
A No, I have not.					
MR. BROOKS: I didn't think he had, your					
Honor.					
(Whereupon, the witness was duly sworn.)					

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

f & L

Page 1, paragraph 13 of the affidavit, the sentence beginning "As the War Minister" down to "diplomatic matters:" exhibit 1104, page 10,081; exhibit 2219, page 15,841; exhibit 2218, page 15,837; exhibit 2216, page 15,832.

Again, page 17, paragraph beginning "As for the problems" down to "independence:" exhibit 1104, page 10,081.

Same page, paragraph beginning "These explanations" down to "Nations:" same exhibit.

Page 19 -- I am not quite sure in which of the sections on this page that part is. It is either the end of 13 or the beginning of 14 -- paragraph beginning "Standing from the League" down to "witnesses:" exhibit 2222, page 15,845.

Page 20, section 14-A, paragraph beginning "To cope with this" down to "Soviet Union:" exhibit 668, page 7,332; exhibit 670, page 7,331.

Page 20 again, second section, paragraph beginning "I do not admit" down to "expression:" exhibit 746, page 7,720; exhibit 747, page 7,727; exhibit 671-A, page 7,336; exhibit 730, page 7,964; and exhibit 667, page 7,309.

25

1- Dec ' 47

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

```
I beg your pardon -- page 35, section 24, paragraph
   beginning "My duty as Education Minister" down to
2
   "meeting:" exhibits 2218, page 15,837; 2219, page
3
   15,841; 271, page 3,460; 1291, page 11,695; 491,
   page 6,037.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CROSS

SHIGEMITSU and Councillor Ting.

Q One moment -- this has nothing to do with that conversation. What I am suggesting to you is now another statement by SHIGEMITSU to Baron HARADA on the same day, the 19th of November.

A And I am convinced that Mr. SHIGEMITSU could never have made such a statement.

Q Did not HIROTA himself say on the same day that he would like to have the declaration in North China, that is the autonomy declaration, issued at such a time that it would not aggravate the Nanking Government?

A No, I have never heard him make such a statement.

Now, only one other matter, I think, that I need ask you about. I will just be sure. Oh, no, there are two.

You say, in paragraph 13 of your affidavit, that meanwhile, that is, during the same period when this North China autonomy business was going on, that the negotiations for the improvement of Sino-Japanese relations were making steady progress.

A By "meanwhile" I did not mean during the same period while the negotiations for the autonomy move-ment were going on, but meanwhile, in a general sort

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Fixel.

COLONEL FIXEL: May I proceed?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

BY COLONEL FIXEL (Continued):

Witness, have you completed your answer to the last question?

A No, I have not. May I continua?

Q Yes.

A I entertained doubts whether Miao Pin was actually and surely maintaining radio communication with Chungking with the wireless apparatus that he had in his possession. And so I arranged to have Miao Pin when coming to Tokyo to bring along with him his wireless apparatus and his operator and have him actually communicate through this apparatus with Chungking and at the same time have our own wireless stations intercept the message to find out whether everything was bona fide.

Q Isn't it a fact that Miao Pin came to Tokyo without his radio apparatus, and that the Japanese refused to fly his apparatus to Japan from Shanghai?

A In my affidavit I have stated that there were various impediments in the way. It was scheduled

8

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

13

12

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

"At the same time the following telegram was received from the Chief of General Staff:

measures taken by the Commander of the Kwantung Army since the night of September 18th are appropriate to the occasion and have enhanced the prestige of the Japanese Army.

"'2. In view of the Chinese attitude, etc. since the outbreak of the incident, the Cabinet has decided not to go beyond what is necessary in dealing with the incident. The Army should, therefore, conform with this principle in its action.'"

Referring back to note on No. 8, Language Section.

As to the circumstances under which these telegrams were sent and received I refer to testimonies of KATAKURA, Tadashi (Court Record pages 18,890; 18,897-18,901), TAKEDA, Hisashi (Court Record pages 19,325-19,327), KAWABE, Torashiro (Court Record page 19,414), and MINAMI (Court Record pages 19,779-19,782) and KOISO (Court Record page 32,217).

I continue reading exhibit No 3420, defense document No. 2739, from paragraph 3 on page 2.

"3. From August 1933 to March 1937 I was attached to the General Staff, Tokyo. During this period

TAKEDA

1

2

3

4

5

6

I now read exhibit 3422-D.

"Sept. 22nd, 1931.

"From: Chief of General Staff.

"To: Commander of Kwantung Army.

"Telegram No. 39.

"'I approve the actions of your army up
to now as timely and upholding the prestige of the
country and the army. As to the future actions,
however, you must maintain the present formation in
line with your original duties, keeping a quiet
watch with strict fairness, unless the situation takes
an extraordinary sudden turn.'"

As to the circumstances mentioned in this telegram, I refer to KAWABE's testimony, court record pages 19,415-19,416.

I next read exhibit 3422-E.

"Sept. 23rd, 1931.

"From: Chief of Staff of Kwantung Army.

"To: Vice-Minister of War and Vice-Chief of General Staff.

"Telegram No. Kan-San 435.

"'The present incident has absolutely no connection with Fushun case reported by Consul-General HAYASHI to the Foreign Minister. Please have no anxiety whatsoever. Details have been told to ANDO.

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

"From: War Minister.

"To: Commander of Kwantung Army.

"Telegram No. Riku-Man 20.

"'Even if the condition in Chientao becomes serious, the military force shall not be used, but the aggravation of the situation ought to be avoided by relying on the police power.'"

As to the circumstances mentioned in these telegrams, I refer to testimonies of KATAKURA, court record pages 18,813-18,924; KAWABE, court record pages 19,416-19,417; and MINAMI, court record pages 19,787-19,788.

In this connection I offer in evidence defense document 1938, an excerpt from exhibit 3038-G, to show that Major-General HASHIMOTO, Toranosuke (not the accused HASHIMOTO) was sent to Manchuria by MINAMI's instructions of September 24, 1931, for the purpose of regulating the actions of the Kwantung Army in conformity with the policy of the government.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1938

will receive exhibit No. 3425.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3425 and received in evidence.)

MUTO

General?

1 2

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23 24

25

Did you at any time at any of the liaison conferences ever hear any member of the Navy advocate an attack upon the United States without notice beforehand?

A I do not remember that at all.

Q Well, do you consider that an important matter, General?

A Yes, it is important.

Q Then, if it occurred, do you not think that you would remember it?

A Yes, I do.

Q Did you attend the Liaison Conference held on December 2nd, 1941?

A I don't believe there was a meeting on the 2nd.

Q Well, if testimony was given before this
Tribunal that Vice-Admiral ITO, then Chief of the
Naval General Staff, at a liaison conference advocated
an attack upon the United States without notice and
that he did so on December 2nd, 1941, would it be at
error on both points?

A I do not recall. According to my memory, no meeting was held on the 2nd of December, 1941, and I do not remember having heard Admiral ITO advocating an

TAKUSHIRO HATTORI, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, having been previously sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WARREN:

Q Will you state your name and present address to the Tribunal. please?

A My name is HATTORI, Takushiro. My address is No. 42 Honmura-Cho, Shinkuku-ku, Tokyo.

MR. "ATREN: May the witness be handed defense document 2230?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Will you examine that document, please, and tell the Court whether or not that is your affidavit and if the contents thereof are true?

A This is unquestionably my af idavit. Its contents are true.

IR. WARREN: At this time, if the Tribunal please, we offer in evidence defense document 2230 except the last paragraph on page 3 commending with the words "knowing the situation" and ending with "Nomenhan Incident."

THE PRISIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

25

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

22

1 Y E I

YEIICHI TATSUMI, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WARREN:

Q Will you state your name and present address to the Tribunal, please?

A My name is TATSUMI, Yeiichi. My address is Inasa, Taisha-machi, Hikawa-Gun, Shimane-ken.

MR. WARREN: May the witness be handed defense document 2489?

Q Will you look at that document and tell the Court whether or not it is your affidavit, and whether or not the contents are true?

A They are true and correct.

MR. WARREN: At this time we offer in evidence defense document No. 2489.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2489

will receive exhibit No. 3189.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3189 and received in evidence.)

MR. WARREN (Reading): "I have been asked if I know anything about General DOHIHARA's attitude

4

2

3

6

8

10

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

- 1	
1	YEIICHI TATSUMI, called as a witness on
2	behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
3	testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. WARREN:
6	Q Will you state your name and present address
7	to the Tribunal, please?
8	A My name is TATSUMI, Yeiichi. My address is
9	Inasa, Taisha-machi, Hikawa-Gun, Shimane-ken.
10	MR. WARREN: May the witness be handed de-
11	fense document 2489?
12	Q Will you look at that document and tell the
13	Court whether or not it is your affidavit, and whether
14	or not the contents are true?
15	A They are true and correct.
16	MR. WARREN: At this time we offer in evidence
17	defense document No. 2489.
18	
19	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2489
20	will receive exhibit No. 3189.
21	
22	referred to was marked defense exhibit No.
23	
24	

I know anything about General DOHIHARA's attitude

toward aggressive war.

"15. The books of HASHIMOTO, Kingoro 'Advice to Youth', 'The Second Creation', 'The Inevitable Renovation', 'How to Rebuild World', 'The Declaration of HASHIMOTO, Kingoro', and his essays in the
'Taiyo Dai Nippon', were all written after he gave up
his military career and had become an ordinary civilian. . . .

"16. The above mentioned books are all reproductions of the essays appearing in the 'Taiyo Dai Nippon'."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Woolworth.

MR. WOOLWORTH: If the Tribunal please, I would invite the Tribunal's attention to paragraph 8 of exhibit 3193; to exhibit 2188, which will be found in the record at pages 15,680-1.

There is no cross-examination of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. HARRIS: I wish now to call the witness

SUZUKI, Takashi, whose testimony is contained in

defense document 2130.

. .

Reichers & Yelden

4

8

10

11

12

MITSUMASA YONAI, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

BY MR. LAZARUS:

Q Will the witness please state his full name?

A YONAI, Mitsumasa.

MR. LAZARUS: May document 2044 please be shown the witness?

(Whereupon, a document was shown to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to read the whole affidavit, surely.

Q Is that your affidavit?

A Yes.

MR. LAZARUS: We offer in evidence defense document 2044, and will omit the last three lines of the last paragraph:

(Reading:) "I was a member of various Japanese Governments over a period of years and since 1937 I held the following position:"

THE PRESIDENT: Wait a minute.

Admitted on the usual terms.

MR. LAZARUS: Oh, I am sorry.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2044

will receive exhibit No. 3198.

d e n

> 13 14

> > 15

17

16

18

20 21

22

23

,24

Reichers & Yelden

M	I	TSUMAS	SA YONAI, called as a witness on	
		behalf of	the defense, being first duly sworn,	
		testified	through Japanese interpreters as follows:	
			DIRECT EXAMINATION	

BY MR. LAZARUS:

Q Will the witness please state his full name?

A YONAI, Mitsumasa.

MR. LAZARUS: May document 2044 please be shown the witness?

(Whereupon, a document was shown to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to read the whole affidavit, surely.

Q Is that your affidavit?

A Yes.

MR. LAZARUS: We offer in evidence defense document 2044, and will omit the last three lines of the last paragraph:

(Reading:) "I was a member of various Japanese Governments over a period of years and since 1937 I held the following position:"

THE PRESIDENT: Wait a minute.

Admitted on the usual terms.

MR. LAZARUS: Oh, I am sorry.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2044

will receive exhibit No. 3198.

d s e n 9

10

3

4

12

13 14

15

16

18

20 21

22

23

24

those corrections state the facts?

MR. McMANUS: I shall ask him, your Honor.
BY MR. McMANUS, (continued):

Q General ARAKI, are the statements you made in your affidavit true?

A It is true.

THE PRESIDENT: No, this affidavit is being amonded without reference to him.

MR. McMANUS: I shall ask him about that, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: It is protty irrogular.

Q General, are the facts just stated, amending the affidavit -- are they true as amended?

A Yes.

MR. McMANUS: Now, if the Court pleases, there are just a few other questions I should like to put to this witness concerning his direct examination.

Q General ARAKI, the prosecution offered in evidence an excerpt from the Japan Advertiser, exhibit 671-A, which is a report of your speech as Education Minister on July 11, 1938, in Osaka at the Osaka Folitical and Economic Research Association, in which you are charged to have said that Japan's determination to fight against the Seviet and China

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

2

4 5

3

6

7

9

. .

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

22

24

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

22

-

24

affairs a long protracted war, lasting ten or twenty years, Japan could not endure such a protracted war -- such an affair. Not war, an affair.

THE MONITOR: Strike out the "war" and just say, with such an idea it would be impossible for Japan to endure an affair which may last ten or twenty years.

THE PRESIDENT: Who said strike out "war," the witness or the interpreter?

THE MONITOR: The interpretor, sir. That was a correction by the monitor.

THE PRESIDENT: Did the witness at any time use the word "war?"

THE MONITOR: No, sir.

A (Continuing) And therefore I told the Economic Association that instead of gotting all in a dither and taking hurried steps to enforce controlled economy, they should take time so that things could be done from a sound basis. Immediately after this speech I made a speech to the same effect at the Osaka Public Hall and therefore if this speech is read it will not be necessary for me to make any further remarks.

MR. McMANUS: May the witness see defense document 674?

Q General, I now show you defense document 674

MR. COMYNS CARR: The first document is a long speech or lecture or essay of twenty-three pages, most of which has nothing whatever to do with the subjects on which he was being interrogated, but relates to his experiences in World War I and the ideas which he formed as a result of those experiences, all of which, irrelevant though in my submission it is, is contained in the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: You contond it is ropo-

MR. COMYNS CAFR: Repetitive and irrelevant; mostly irrelevant.

THE PRESIDENT: It is hardly likely that he had made in this document now tendered a point which he omitted from his affidavit, but it may be so.

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

14

17

16

18 19

20

22

24

was raised by me on the first document. It wasn't overlooked. Well, I will take the views of my colleagues, but if we give a decision on one document and immediately after reverse it for no good reason on the next, where do we stand?

By a majority the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

MR. McMANUS: I now ask that the witness be shown defense document 1899-D.

I believe the witness is looking at defense document 1835. 1899-D is the one I request that he be shown.

THE PRESIDENT: Apparently the Marshal of the Court hasn't that.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If your Honor pleases, no such document is on the list served upon us, nor, as far as I can place it, is the document on the order of proof.

I am mistaken.

THE PRESIDENT: It is on the Judges order of proof.

MR. McMANUS: Mr. Carr stated he overlooked it, that it is on his order of proof, your Honor.

(Wheroupon, Mr. Comyns Carr took

28,254

a position in front of the lectorn.)

THE PRESIDENT: It is not tondered yet, Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. McMANUS: May I put the question to the witness, if the Court pleases?

Q General, I show you a statement by General UEDA depicting his efforts to settle the Shanghai Incident. Will you tell us whether or not you directed General UEDA to make this statement, or is this the statement you teld General UEDA to make?

MR. COMYNS CARR: The prosecution objects to that question. This is one of the type of documents which is, in our submission, covered by the uncompleted argument, which is to be resumed as soon as my friend has finished asking the witness questions. In our submission, its admissibility or otherwise will be covered by the decision on that point.

THE PRESIDENT: His direction given to the army, either given by himself or others, would not be in the nature of a self-serving statement at all.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the point I am making has nothing to do with solf-serving state-ments. The point is that the document is part of the general history of that phase --

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, I see.

1

2

.

6

7

8

10

11

12

...

15

16

17

18 19

21

22

23

24

MR. COMYNS CARR: (Continuing) -- and whether it will be admitted at this stage depends upon the result of the application which the learned Chief Prosecutor made yesterday which has not yet been concluded.

THE FRESIDENT: But did AR I make this statement or did he get General UEDA to make it?

MR. McMANUS: It is my intention to bring out through the witness that he instructed General UEDA to make it.

THE FRESIDENT: He should be at liberty to state his own personal part in these matters. That was recognized yesterday by the learned Chief Counsel when he said there may be exceptions. This may be one.

By a majority the Court overrules the objection and allows the question.

BY MR. McMANUS: (Continued)

Q Will you please answer the question, General?

A The document which was just shown to me was a different one. I would like to have the proper one shown to me.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: 1899-D? Is that the one you want?

MR. McMANUS: Yes.

(Whereupon, a document was handed

2

1

4

•

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to the witness.)

THE WITNESS: This is a statement made by Divisional Commander UEDA on the front lines, and the contents of this statement include the instructions which I gave him at the time he left for his post.

THE INTERFRETER: "Based on his understanding of my intention as embodied in instructions give him at his departure."

AR. McMANUS: I offer same in evidence, if the Court pleases.

THE PRESIDENT: Were the instructions in writing?

THE WITNESS: I recognize -- I believe that the instructions were given in writing.

THE PRESIDENT: This is admitted on the usual terms, without objection.

MR. McMANUS: At this point, if the Tribunal pleases, I have other documents, but I request that I may be permitted to suspend now so that the argument may be continued on the question raised by Mr. Keenan yesterday.

to the witness.)

THE WITNESS: This is a statement made by Divisional Commander UEDA on the front lines, and the contents of this statement include the instructions which I gave him at the time he left for his post.

THE INTERFRETER: "Based on his understanding of my intention as embodied in instructions give him at his departure."

R. McMANUS: I offer same in evidence, if the Court pleases.

THE PRESIDENT: Were the instructions in writing?

THE WITNESS: I recognize -- I believe that the instructions were given in writing.

THE PRESIDENT: This is admitted on the usual terms, without objection.

MR. McMANUS: At this point, if the Tribunal pleases, I have other documents, but I request that I may be permitted to suspend now so that the argument may be continued on the question raised by Mr. Keenan yesterday.

to the witness.)

THE WITNESS: This is a statement made by Divisional Commander UEDA on the front lines, and the contents of this statement include the instructions which I gave him at the time he left for his post.

THE INTERFRETER: "Based on his understanding of my intention as embodied in instructions give him at his departure."

R. McMANUS: I offer same in evidence, if the Court pleases.

THE PRESIDENT: Were the instructions in writing?

THE WITNESS: I recognize -- I believe that the instructions were given in writing.

THE PRESIDENT: This is admitted on the usual terms, without objection.

MR. McMANUS: At this point, if the Tribunal pleases, I have other documents, but I request that I may be permitted to suspend now so that the argument may be continued on the question raised by Mr. Keenan yesterday.

This application is untimely as it should have been made last February when the defendants commenced presentation of evidence in the general phases.

Dr. KIYOSE stated in his opening statement, on Pages 17,013 and 17,014 of the record, with respect to the general phases: ". . . So the defendants and their counsel have come to an agreement that they will. produce, as far as possible, evidence in common where the offenses charged are in common." With respect to the individual phases he stated: "It may be probable that since the interests, views and actions of some of the accused were opposed to each other, conflicting evidence will be presented. In so doing some of the accused may, from their own standpoint, demand exceptions to the facts and evidence as adduced in the above five divisions or may furnish other evid-

No objection was then made (by the prosecution to the procedure adopted by the defendants of presenting their evidence in general phases and in individual phases.

ence in their individual interest."

pass on to the great beyond without any result.

THE PRESIDENT: Throughout the trial, the Tribunal has been consistent in rejecting everything irrelevant, immaterial and repetitive and will continue to do so. We will reserve ou decision.

Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: It is not my intention to read exhibit 3163-A at this time, if the Court please. I shall proceed to another document.

May the witness be shown defense document 1899-A, please?

> (Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

This is a statement of Army Commander SHIRA -KAWA made to the 9th Division whereby he expressed a reluctance to fight re the Shanghai Incident.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. McMANUS (Continued):

General, can you tell us wother or not you gave Commander SHIRAKAWA such instructions?

The views -- the policies of the government and of the army concurred, and the same instructions which were given to Divisional Commander UEDA at the time of his departure were also given to General SHIRAKAWA at the time of his departure.

1

4

3

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q General ARAKI, what is the extent of your acquaintance with the defendant TOGO, Shigenori?

A As public men I had hardly anything to do with him -- we had hardly anything to do with each other.

Q You have stated in your affidavit that at no time did you conspire with anyone to commit any of the crimes charged by the prosecution. You have read the Indictment, of course?

A Yes, I have.

Q Now I wish to ask you whether at any time between the first of January 1928 and the second of September 1945 you discussed with the defendant TOGO the formulation or execution of a plan that "Japan should secure the military, naval, political and economic domination of East Asia and of the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and of all countries and islands therein and bordering thereon and for that purpose (Japan) should alone or in combination with other countries having simular objects, or who could be induced or corred to join therein, wage declared or undeclared war or wars of aggression, and war or wars in violation of international law, treaties, agreements and

.1

. 3

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

4

6

1

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal still has control of its own proceeding. We desire to hear you, Major Blakeney, unless you have concluded.

MR. BLAKENEY: I had done, your Honor.

MR. WARREN: I would not presume to take the microphone from an attorney who had not finished, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: That attorney did not announce to the Court that he had finished his examination. If he did, I did not hear his announcement.

MR. WARREN: Now, your Honor, in view of what I said before the objection was interposed, I have a question which I feel that I should ask each of the witnesses, each of the accused who take the stand as a witness. I want to know if your Honor feels that the ruling covers that question. I will tell you briefly what it is.

THE PRESIDENT: If you put a question to the witness and objection is taken, the Tribunal will decid on the objection.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, sir.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. WARREN:

Q General ARAKI, you have been accused by the Indictment in this case of having conspired with many

of the accused under different counts. Did you ever at any time enter into a conspiracy by word, act, or deed to your knowledge with the accused DOHIHARA or with the accused HIRANUMA?

THE PRESIDENT: The accused has already answered that in his affidavit.

MR. WARREN: He has, your Honor. I wanted to explain to the Court why I asked that. By a process of elimination somewhere down the line if none of the accused ever talked to these men, it would not appear they could have entered into a common plan. That is the reason, but if the ruling of the Court previously covered it we shall not ask it any more. But I do want to show that I should have asked those questions of each of the accused who take the witness stand.

THE PRESIDENT: The accused has already denied any conspiracy with any of the other accused. He need not repeat his denial.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

CROSS

BY MR . COMYNS CARR:

Q Now, General ARAKI, on page 4, paragraph 2 of your affidavit and in section 28 of your affidavit, beginning at page 38, you say that no reliance can be placed upon your interrogations because the interpreters were incompetent, and you say that the interpreters admitted their incompetence.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Would Mr. Kildoyle kindly stand up, please?

(Whereupon, Mr. Kildoyle arose.)

Q Would you turn around, General, and look at him? He is behind you.

THE PRESIDENT: Bring him into the courtroom, Mr. Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Would you gentlemen stand forward, please? Come forward here, Mr. Kildoyle, will you please and turn towards the witness.

(Whereupon, Mr. Kildoyle and two other men approached the center of the floor and faced the witness.)

Q Do you remember this gentlemen, General? He was in army uniform when you saw him.

A I think I have seen him before.

Q He interpreted at your interrogations on no

1 2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

18

19 20

21

22

24

less than eight occasions; don't you remember that?

sure that this Tribunal wants to elicit the true facts, and I sincerely hope that possibly you might get answers if the questions are understood by the witnesses. That is all I am trying to do right now: Does the witness understand the question?

THE PRESIDENT: As the transcript will show, the question was perfectly clear. It was not capable of being misunderstood.

I have appeals from my colleagues to discipline you, Mr. McManus. I can assure you not one is with you in this. Counsel forget, when they behave this way, that the transcript will be the best answer to them if any question arises.

THE WITNESS: There seems to have been some confusion with regard to the last question, and so if I should state the point clearly I will say this, that the development of Manchukuo in accordance with the principle of the Kingly Way for the creation of a peaceful state was not directed in the proper direction. That is all.

Q Only one other question I will ask you about that. Whom do you blame for that state of affairs?

A That is not for me to answer. It is not for me to answer that question because I am speaking of matters after I left the office of War Minister and

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

question" is not supported by the record. If prosecution had sought in February the ruling it now seeks
that evidence would have been presented in the general
phases and the general phases would have taken that
much more time. By failure of the prosecution to object to the procedure at those various times the accused will have been lulled into a false sense of security if the order prayed for is granted.

At times the Tribunal has indicated that general evidence would be more appropriate in the individual phases. For example, on page 25,891 of the record the following appears:

"THE PRESIDENT: The majority of the Tribunal think that as this affidavit is contested by some of the accused it should not be read in the general phase. Therefore, the objection is sustained. It may be read on behalf of those individuals who support it, of course, subject to other objections that are open."

We also recall other instances where documents of a general nature were rejected with the
ruling that if it could be shown in the individual
cases that any of the accused relied on the matter
set forth in the documents offered it could then be
presented. In a number of instances, witnesses who
were called in the general phases were not examined

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: I notice one of the accused is absent from the dock apart altogether from the

witness. I have not been notified of that.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the

Tribunal please, I offer the following language cor-

rections:

Record page 28,235, line 23, delete from "state" to the end of the paragraph and substitute "case it would be impossible to endure for a long period of ten or twenty years."

THE PRESIDENT: The accused KAYA, with the permission of the Tribunal, will be absent for the first session today consulting with his counsel.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

16

18

19

20

S A D A O A R A K I, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

21

CROSS-EXAMINATION

22

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

23 24

25

Q General ARAKI, when the Tribunal adjourned yesterday I had asked you what it was which caused you to be dissatisfied with the state of affairs in

THE PRESIDENT: We will follow the conventional course from which Mr. Carr has not yet departed.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The Tribunal may remember that in the cross-exemination of other witnesses, particularly MINAMI, I and other counsel put a number of questions which were vehemently objected to on behalf of the defense because they asserted that, if questions were being put, based upon any document, the document should there and then be produced. The Tribunal ruled that the questions could be put regardless of the source, if any, of the information, provided they were otherwise proper questions, but intimated that they would expect that at the proper time the documents on which the questions were founded should be offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Having regard to the attitude which the defense then adopted, I am offering now to produce here and now the documents on which my questions are going to be based, if either the Tribunal or the defense desire to see them at this stage. But, if it is preferred that they should be reserved until tendered in rebuttal, if they are tendered, if it is necessary to tender them, then, of course, I do not press the offer.

3

4 5

6

7

.

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

25

what ARAKI's thoughts were, but also his attitude at the time of the China Incident and at the time of the Pacific War.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, it is a short question. According to this effidavit, the accused ARAKI advised the Niseis in America to be loyal to America. And ARAKI, according to the witness, never attempted any justification of the war between America and Japan. What relevance has that?

Now, we do not want a long statement about nothing in particular. Give us a reply to that.

MR. SUGAWARA: The fundamental principles underlying ARAKI's ideas can be found in his address to the Niseis telling them to be loyal to America. And also this witness shows that ARAKI bent every effort, vis-a-vis America, so that the Japanese-American conflict would not break out.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. SUGAWARA: Mr. McManus will continue with the presentation of evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: At this time, if the Tribunal pleases, I should like to offer defense document 573.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

25

24

what ARAKI's thoughts were, but also his attitude at the time of the China Incident and at the time of the Pacific War.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, it is a short question. According to this affidavit, the accused ARAKI advised the Niseis in America to be loyal to America. And ARAKI, according to the witness, never attempted any justification of the war between America and Japan. What relevance has that?

Now, we do not want a long statement about nothing in particular. Give us a reply to that.

MR. SUGAWARA: The fundamental principles underlying ARAKI's ideas can be found in his address to the Niseis telling them to be loyal to America. And also this witness shows that ARAKI bent every effort, vis-a-vis America, so that the Japanese-American conflict would not break out.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. SUGAWARA: Mr. McManus will continue with the presentation of evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.

MR. McMANUS: At this time, if the Tribunal pleases, I should like to offer defense document 573.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

.

that this item was taken from the newspapers commenting on these two men and the report thus received
from the press was reported in this particular report.

DOHIHARA's name constantly appeared in the newspapers.

Furthermore, newspaper comments frequently reported
to the effect that DOHIHARA was eng sed in conspiracies and various plots but, as a matter of fact, during
the years that I served under General DOHIHARA there
was not one iota of any evidence of his ever participating in such movements.

CROSS

THE PRESIDENT: We do not want this witness to digress to that extent. I notice that this document has attached a certificate of source and authenticity and it could have been tendered direct and would be admitted subject to its having probative value.

JUDGE NYI: Your Honor --

THE PRESIDENT: We will take it as tendered with that certificate. The only question is, what probative value has it, and if it has any, is it properly translated. We can only refer it if we decide to admit it.

WARREN: Your Honor, in view of this witness' explanation as to what these items are we feel it has lost probative value, but if the Court

A-1--

.

of the

of the affidavit. But, what is the purpose of the cross-examination?

JUDGE NYI: Your Honor, in our submission, this has a very close relation to the activities of the accused DOHIHARA, and they were both in Tokyo at that time.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that your reason? That doesn't appear to be sufficient. There may be another. The NAKAMURA case played some part.

As I am reminded, it is one of three hundred matters that is supposed to have been causing trouble between China and Japan, but the prosecution gave it very little attention. It is also dealt with, I am reminded, in the Lytton report.

What can this witness add? What can he do except waste time.

JUDGE NYI: Your Honor, this witness said that he had a talk with DOHIHARA in Tokyo, and we might get from this witness what we e the views of DOHIHARA in this case, and which were not in the Lytton report.

THE PRESIDENT: If we are going into all these details at this length, we will never finish.

JUDGE NYI: May it please your Honor, we will drop this point.

A Yes, that is so.

Q And, did they not capture Ichang?

THE MONITOR: What province?

MR. SUTTON: I-c-h-a-n-g.

A Yes.

Q And, did not the troops under his command, during 1942 and '43 and '44, in China, capture Lung-ling, Tunchung, Changteh, Chinchow, Loyang, Changsha, the capital of Hunan Province, Hengyang, Kweilin, and Liuchow?

A Yes, just as you stated in your question, these places were captured.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, with regard to that portion of this affidavit which deals with the treatment of prisoners of war in China, questions and answers 14, 15, and 16, the prosecution respectfully draws the attention of the Tribunal to the following portions of the evidence concerning the treatment of prisoners of war in those portions of China under General HATA's command:

As to Hong Kong and that vicinity, exhibits 1590 to 1608 inclusive, record 13,162 to 13,185, and the testimony of Barnett, record 13,112 to 13,147;

As to Shanghai and other parts of China, the following exhibits: exhibits 1888 to 1896 inclusive,

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

· un wec

2

500 40

3

6

7

9

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22 23

24

THE PRESIDENT: You are not likely to finish 1 the presentation of your evidence today, apart from 2 ARITA, or tomorrow, perhaps. 3 MR. YAMAOKA: I understand, if your Honors 4 please, that Mr. OKAMOTO desires to conduct crossexamination on behalf of General MINAMI. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. OKAMOTO. 8 9 KAZUE KUWASHIMA, recalled as a witness 10 on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and 11 testified through Japanese interpreters as 12 follows: 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 14 BY MR. T. OKAMOTO: 15 Did the witness visit Manchuria or China in 16 1935? 17 According to my recollection, it was in 1936 18 that I made this visit. 19 Did you not in 1935? 20 According to my recollection, it was in 1936. A 21 Who was the Japanese Ambassador to Manchuria 22 in 1935? 23 According to my recollection, it was General 24 MINAMI that was Ambassador in 1935.

Was General MINAMI, as Ambassador, under the

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: You are not likely to finish 1 the presentation of your evidence today, apart from 2 ARITA, or tomorrow, perhaps. 3 MR. YAMAOKA: I understand, if your Honors 4 please, that Mr. OKAMOTO desires to conduct cross-5 examination on behalf of General MINAMI. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. OKAMOTO. 7 8 KUWASHIMA, recalled as a witness 9 KAZUE 10 on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and 11 testified through Japanese interpreters as 12 follows: 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 14 BY MR. T. OKAMOTO: 15 Did the witness visit Manchuria or China in 16 1935? 17 According to my recollection, it was in 1936 18 that I made this visit. 19 Did you not in 1935? 20 According to my recollection, it was in 1936. 21 Q Who was the Japanese Ambassador to Manchuria 22 in 1935? According to my recollection, it was General MINAMI that was Ambassador in 1935.

Was General MINAMI, as Ambassador, under the

supervision of the Foreign Minister? Yes, as you say. You were the Director of the Bureau of East Asiatic Affairs at that time, were you not? A Yes, I was.

1 2 3

MR. YAMAOKA: We offer in evidence defense document 2153. This is an answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA to a question in the House of Representatives at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet, on February 21, 1935.

I only intend to read from the sentence beginning at the latter part of the page, "I think," to the end.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as repetitive, and also on the ground that the part which my learned friend proposed to read is entirely opinion.

THE PRESIDENT: There was less than a month between the speech just rejected and this, and they all have the same tener, to say the least.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe that Mr. HIROTA in his prior speeches. mentions the points that I intend to read here, and as for opinion, why, this is the statement of the accused himself, given in answer to an interpellation in the Diet.

Our purpose in introducing documents of this type, which your Honors have no doubt noticed on the order of proof, is to show the consistency of Mr.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

MR. YAMAOKA: We offer in evidence defense document 2153. This is an answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA to a question in the House of Representatives at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet, on February 21, 1935.

I only intend to read from the sentence beginning at the latter part of the page, "I think," to the end.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as repetitive, and also on the ground that the part which my learned friend proposed to read is entirely opinion.

THE PRESIDENT: There was less than a month between the speech just rejected and this, and they all have the same tenor, to say the least.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe that Mr. HIROTA in his prior speeches mentions the points that I intend to read here, and as for opinion, why, this is the statement of the accused himself, given in answer to an interpellation in the Diet.

Our purpose in introducing documents of this type, which your Honors have no doubt noticed on the order of proof, is to show the consistency of Mr.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

Have you anything to say?

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in our submission, this document meets the issues raised by the prosecution that Japan was conducted along, that I the country was conducted along totalitarian lines in furtherance of the conspiracy charged in the Indictment

THE PRESIDENT: As such it is an attempt to swear the issue. I realize relevant issued are the counts and not the particulars supporting.

MR. YAMAOKA: Furthermore, the prosecution has also charged that the relationship between Japan and Germany was one in furtherance of a conspiracy to dominate the world. In our submission, this document does disclose that that relationship was not carried out to the extent contended by the prosecution. It was, furthermore, a contemporary document and shows Mr. HIROTA's views on this subject.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAM'AOKA: If the Tribunal please, Mr. HANAI will present the next witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. HANAI.

MR. HANAI: May the witness INO, Hiroya be called.

CD.

AFTERNOON SESSION

K 3 p 80 K a p

5

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

0

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

HIROYA INO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, my associate, Mr. HANAI, is handling this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: I'r. HANAI.

IR. HANAI: I should like to conduct a brief cross-examination.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HANAI:

Was there ever an occasion when a document went direct to the president of the Bureau of Planning without first passing through your office, that of the vice-president, in relation to documents and plans such as the Five-Year Plan?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I object to that question. It does not arise out of cross-examination. The only matter on which I cross-examined was whether HIROTA was

AFTERNOON SESSION

K 2 3 a p 4 p 5 & 6 K a 7 p 8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

24

22

25

0

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

HIROYA INO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, my associate, Mr. HANAI, is handling this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: I'r. HANAI.

PR. HANAI: I should like to conduct a brief cross-examination.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HANAI:

Was there ever an occasion when a document went direct to the president of the Bureau of Planning without first passing through your office, that of the vice-president, in relation to documents and plans such as the Five-Year Plan?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I object to that question.

It does not arise out of cross-examination. The only
matter on which I cross-examined was whether HIROTA was

appointed vice-premier at the same time that he was appointed president of the Planning Bureau.

MR. HANAI: I should like to get the Court's permission to put my question.

7 8

appointed vice-premier at the same time that he was appointed president of the Planning Bureau.

MR. HANAI: I should like to get the Court's permission to put my question.

As to the objections to paragraph numbered 15, the sentences relative to Japanese public opinion, although the word opinion is used, this, I do not believe, is a statement of opinion by the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not the objection.

The objection is that it is too much for any one man to say and it certainly does involve an opinion on the part of the person expressing the opinion.

However, if public opinion could be relevant, I do not know how else you could establish it.

MR. YAMAOKA, I was going to add, if your Honor please, that this public opinion is naturally a matter of vital concern to men in public office because they rely upon it and act upon it, while admittedly it may be difficult of ascertaining.

As to the objection in paragraph 18, I believe that my point just discussed covers this matter.

I believe that covers the principal points of the objections.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court sustains the objections and admits the document to the extent not objected to, on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2146 will receive exhibit No. 3260.

HORINOUCHI 29,724

theories and the like for the facility of this Court which is burdened with such a great, grave problem.

THE PRESIDENT: The United States practice is also the Australian practice. The decision of July last year was based on the United States practice and on the Australian practice. The decision was repeated again only a week ago by me on an objection by Mr. Brown of the British prosecution. Since I repeated that decision on Mr. Brown's objection, at least two Members, I think, if not three Members of the Tribunal, have made suggestions that they are going to be bound by or to consider only what is read into the transcript and I told the counsel on both sides of that as soon as the opportunity arose. From two of the Members I have received written notes to that effect. One I received only this morning as you were addressing me, Mr. Chief of Counsel.

I have no intention of telling you what any Fember has written or said to me without his consent but I may read what one Hember has just written: "The parts of documents not read by the attorney presenting them should not be considered in evidence."

I read what another Member has written to me this morning: "If, when a document is admitted, the whole of the document forms part of the evidence, why

1 2

the majority.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There is no question about that. But after you have admitted it, what the Court considers has been admitted is the question here.

Now, the third observation is, your Honor, there have been a great many documents admitted in this Tribunal that have not been read. They have been referred to and they have been considered or not considered evidence by some Nembers of the Tribunal. It is very difficult to determine from down here what, up there, is considered evidence.

In my case, I have read many of the vital parts of documents and have left the minor or detailed parts for the perusal of the Tribunal at its leisure, or for reference in summation, or to use in any manner in which I see fit, after it has been admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not one of the alleged minority, Mr. Cunningham. We would like to hear the minority, the people who think that, after all, only what is read into the transcript is evidence.

However, I don't want to curtail you observations yet.

the majority.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: There is no question about that. But after you have admitted it, what the Court considers has been admitted is the question here.

Now, the third observation is, your Honor, there have been a great many documents admitted in this Tribunal that have not been read. They have been referred to and they have been considered or not considered evidence by some Hembers of the Tribunal. It is very difficult to determine from down here what, up there, is considered evidence.

In my case, I have read many of the vital parts of documents and have left the minor or detailed parts for the perusal of the Tribunal at its leisure, or for reference in summation, or to use in any manner in which I see fit, after it has been admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not one of the alleged minority, Mr. Cunningham. We would like to hear the minority, the people who think that, after all, only what is read into the transcript is evidence.

However, I don't want to curtail you observations yet.

MARSFAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: -- review the decision of the Tribunal given in July 1946 and repeated recently. If the whole of a document has been tendered in evidence, but only part has been read, it will be open to any counsel on summation to refer to unread parts, if necessary or desirable in his viewpoint.

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: Mr. President, the first few words of your statement didn't come over the IBM.

THE PRESIDENT: No Member of the Tribunal desires to review the decision of the Tribunal given in July 1946 and repeated recently. If the whole of a document has been tendered and received in evidence, but only part has been read, the unread part may be referred to in summation, if necessary or desirable in the view of the particular counsel.

!R. LOGAN: Well, if the Tribunal please, I think that still leaves the question unanswered. I understood fully the Tribunal's decision as a whole, but how about those two Judges; are they still going to exclude evidence which is not read into the transcript? I think that is important for all of us to know.

THE PRESIDENT: The two Judges referred to are

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

document like this or subsequently to refer it to him, is it not? Yes, as you say. A Have you any reason to doubt that you folloved the usual practice in this case? I have no exact recollection. and you have no reason to doubt that you followed your usual practice. No. Now, referring to the document 1973 where Q it was stated the Government-General and the Army are both strongly desirous of having the prisoners in Korca, did you take any steps to bring before the Government. General the reactions of the people to the arrival of these prisoners? No, we didn't.

Q Why didn't you?

A Because it was not our duty to report to the Government-General.

Q But in a telegram sent by your predocessor you have stated to the Vice-Minister of War that the Government-General is very desirous that prisoners should be taken to Korea.

A Since, when I assumed my post; my predecessor did not tell me anything in regard to this tele-

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

(Continuing) May I ask you again, the docu-A ment I have received is 1579, not 1975. COLONEL MORNANE: 1975 it should be, 1975. 3 The witness says he has received 1579, not 1975. Was that the first document to which I re-5 ferred you, witness? Is the title of that "Recollections Among 7 the General Public Following Internment of British 8 POW's"? That is right. 0 10 I am afraid I do not recollect whether or 11 not I showed this report to the commander-in-chief. 12 13 You knew from previous correspondence the 14 very purpose for which he wanted prisoners of war 15 sent to Korea was shown to have been partially 16 achieved in these reports. 17 This report, as I have stated in my affi-18 davit, is a compilation of the reactions of the 19 general public towards the prisoners of war taken in 20 Malaya and elsewhere and interned. We did not write 21 this report necessarily with the -- we did not compile 22 this report calling attention to the purport given 23 in the first part of the previous document. 24

Witness, your usual practice is to have the

approval of the commander-in-chief when you send a

NOTE:

25

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

 Q Does it say, did it read that: "According to the object described in separate telegram, Kwantung Staff I, Telegram 762, we decided to concentrate a part of the forces outside the Great Wall in order to suitably cooperate with the China Garrison Army in case of need and issued orders at noon today, the 12th, to take the following measures:"

CROSS

ent Infantry Regiment, one light tank company of the Third Tank Battalion, one battalion of the 9th Heavy Field Artillery Regiment and the First Independent Engineer Company shall be placed under the command of the Commander of the First Mixed Brigade and shall be made to concentrate the forces near Shanhaikwan by November 15 so as to be prepared for advancing into North China. However, as to advancing to the south of Shanhaikwan, same shall depend on army orders."

Did it read that way?

A Yes, just as you say.

JUDGE NYI: Your Honor, we tender this in evidence, IPS document 644-C.

MR. BROOKS: If your Honor please, I would like to have the parent document, the Manchurian Secret Diary, marked for identification, from which

MR. BROOKS: My point, your Honor, was aimed at its being of little probative value because of the issues in the case, and the relevance of it to the main issues is very insignificant.

THE PRESIDENT: A question is raised by a Member of the Tribunal as to the extent to which documents admitted against one accused can be used against all. If a document is tendered against all the accused and counsel for one accused shows clearly that it has no application to his client or has no probative value at all, but other counsel raise no objection, I do not see how we can fail to consider the objection on its merits.

morning through this witness, and they were bound by the witness, by what the witness said, for the time being, that these accounts related only to Japanese-administere railways. If we had decided that document was evidence against MINAMI, who objected to it, we would have given a wrong decision. But it was not objected to by other accused, and it was admitted against them because the Court does not take objections to evidence on those grounds, not yet. If evidence tendered against one accused is in fact evidence against all of them, and there is no ojbection from others, of course it goes in against

, **1**

MR. BROOKS: My point, your Honor, was aimed at its being of little probative value because of the issues in the case, and the relevance of it to the main issues is very insignificant.

THE PRESIDENT: A question is raised by a Member of the Tribunal as to the extent to which documents admitted against one accused can be used against all. If a document is tendered against all the accused and counsel for one accused shows clearly that it has no application to his client or has no probative value at all, but other counsel raise no objection, I do not see how we can fail to consider the objection on its merits.

morning through this witness, and they were bound by the witness, by what the witness said, for the time being, that these accounts related only to Japanese-administere railways. If we had decided that document was evidence against MINAMI, who objected to it, we would have given a wrong decision. But it was not objected to by other accused, and it was admitted against them because the Court does not take objections to evidence on those grounds, not yet. If evidence tendered against one accused is in fact evidence against all of them, and there is no ojbection from others, of course it goes in against

MR. BROOKS: My point, your Honor, was aimed at its being of little probative value because of the issues in the case, and the relevance of it to the main issues is very insignificant.

THE PRESIDENT: A question is raised by a Member of the Tribunal as to the extent to which documents admitted against one accused can be used against all. If a document is tendered against all the accused and counsel for one accused shows clearly that it has no application to his client or has no probative value at all, but other counsel raise no objection, I do not see how we can fail to consider the objection on its merits.

The prosecution succeeded in establishing this morning through this witness, and they were bound by the witness, by what the witness said, for the time being, that these accounts related only to Japanese-administered railways. If we had decided that document was evidence against MINAMI, who objected to it, we would have given a wrong decision. But it was not objected to by other accused, and it was admitted against them because the Court does not take objections to evidence on those grounds, not yet. If evidence tendered against one accused is in fact evidence against all of them, and there is no ojbection from others, of course it goes in against

MR. BROOKS: My point, your Honor, was aimed at its being of little probative value because of the issues in the case, and the relevance of it to the main issues is very insignificant.

THE PRESIDENT: A question is raised by a Member of the Tribunal as to the extent to which documents admitted against one accused can be used against all. If a document is tendered against all the accused and counsel for one accused shows clearly that it has no application to his client or has no probative value at all, but other counsel raise no objection, I do not see how we can fail to consider the objection on its merits.

morning through this witness, and they were bound by the witness, by what the witness said, for the time being, that these accounts related only to Japanese-administere railways. If we had decided that document was evidence against MINAMI, who objected to it, we would have given a wrong decision. But it was not objected to by other accused, and it was admitted against them because the Court does not take objections to evidence on those grounds, not yet. If evidence tendered against one accused is in fact evidence against all of them, and there is no ojbection from others, of course it goes in against

please, Judge Nyi?

25

1	A I believe you will find it in the affidavit,
1	but a man called FURUNO, Inosuke, visited me at the
2	battle front about one month previously and talked with
3	me on various subjects. He stayed there three days.
4	Q You are not answering my question. You are
5	talking about how your invitation came from KONOYE.
6	Let me ask you a simpler question. Who, if any,
7	recommended you to KONOYE for this post?
8	A I don't know.
9	Q Was it not ISHIHARA?
0	A ISHIHARA had no reason to engage in such
1 2	political activities. I know nothing about it.
3	Q Was it not KIDO?
4	A I don't know.
5	Q When you assumed office as War Minister, who
6	was the Vice War Minister?
7	A The Vice-Minister had just been changed. It
8	was then Lieutenant-General TOJO.
9	Q Did you pick up TOJO?
20	A No, not so. My consent was asked for later.
21	Q Was it a fact that he came to the office of
22	War Minister before you did?
23	THE MONITOR: Will you repeat the question.

Q I asked: Was it a fact that TOJO came in

1

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

accused person, I think that you should have no arrangement with him to read anything except as a witness here in the box. You should be able to judge at a glance whether there are records of the meeting that he attended as one of those five persons. BY JUDGE NYI (Continued):

As a member of the Five Ministers' Conference, could you recognize that these were the decisions reached by the Five Ministers' Conference?

A No, I cannot.

THE PRESIDENT: Would you be influenced if you were satisfied the government certified to those records as minutes of the meetings of those ministers?

THE WITNESS: As I stated before, no records or minutes were kept of these meetings, and I cannot say with responsibility that these are records of that meeting. And, if it should turn out that there were records or minutes taken, I cannot be responsible for that.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not the question I asked.

THE MONITOR: Japanese court reporter! (Whereupon, the Japanese court reporter read.)

THE MONITOR: The interpretation of the last

was, if the affidavit was presented to this witness, would be accept it, and that is asking him to certify to the certificate. That is what I am objecting to, if your Honor please.

THE PRESIDENT: I asked him whether he admitted the certificate was what it purported to be, and any witness can make an admission. The question might have been put on a letter, and there would have been no doubt about it. But since he cannot read English, it is useless to pursue this further. That means the documents cannot be admitted at this stage. We have not sufficient material on which to admit them.

JUDGE NYI: We will question him.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

_ _ .

was, if the affidavit was presented to this witness, would be accept it, and that is asking him to certify to the certificate. That is what I am objecting to,

if your Honor please.

THE PRESIDENT: I asked him whether he admitted the certificate was what it purported to be, and any witness can make an admission. The question might have been put on a letter, and there would have been no doubt about it. But since he cannot read English, it is useless to pursue this further. That means the documents cannot be admitted at this stage. We have not sufficient material on which to admit them.

JUDGE NYI: We will question him.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess

was taken.)

Duda & Spratt

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kraft.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (CAPTAIN KRAFT): If the Tribunal please, we submit that IPS document No. 1632, exhibit No. 3341, record pages 31,392-3, lines 4-2 on the second page, is in substance an acceptable translation of the KIDO Diary of 12 December 1938.

Reference, prosecution exhibit No. 1135,
KIDO's Diary of 6 September 1941, record page 10,216,
line 3, delete "only." The sentence should read,
"The Emperor should give a warning." etc.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kraft, if you will give a copy of these language corrections to the Language Section we will get a simultaneous translation.

Mr. Chief of Counsel.

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

Q The voice was a pretty powerful one, wasn't it?

A In any event there were hostilities going on; so the voice was strong.

Q Well, isn't it the truth that the Prime Minister of Japan, KONOYE, in December of 1937, was actually in the position where he had to find out from the High Command what terms of peace he really could offer to Chiang Kai-shek?

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

19

20 21

23

of this witness, the prosecution consents to his affidavit being read.

> MR. HOWARD: Beginning at paragraph 1 --THE PRESIDENT: It is not tendered.

I take it, it is tendered. It is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 495 will receive exhibit No. 3351.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3351 and received in evidence.)

documents addressed to the Vice-Minister of War? COLONEL MORNANE: If the Tribunal pleases, 2 I object to this as not arising out of examination in chief. THE PRESIDENT: How does it arise? 6 MR. HOWARD: The document that he just read in evidence was addressed to the Vice-Minister. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Well, that does not make that 9 question admissible. Objection allowed. 10 MR. HOWARD: May the witness be excused on 11 the usual terms? 12 THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. 13 (Whereupon the witness was 14 excused.) 15 MR. HOWARD: That concludes the indivudual 16 phase of KIMURA. 17 THE FRESIDENT: I understand the Russian 18 witnesses for cross-examination are now available. 19 COLONEL IVANOV: I now call the witness 20 TAKEBE, Rokuzo. 21 22 THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov, at this stage all you can do is call the witness for cross-

examination by the defense. Do you propose to do any

23

24

25

more than that?

position of Chief of General Affairs?

At the time I assumed the post of Chief of the General Affairs Board of Manchukuo, the talk with regard to my possible assumption of that office was brought to me by one, YUZAWA, Michio, who came as a representative of General UMEZU.

1	Q Was YUZAWA, Michio a military man?
2	A No, not a military man.
3	Q Home Ministry man, wasn't he?
4	A Yes, an official of the Home Ministry
5	Q What did he tell you when he came to you?
6	A It was an oral request made to me, asking me
7	to take over the post as Chief of the General Affairs
8	of the Manchukuo Government, which request I accepted.
9	Q Did Mr. YUZAWA tell you how General UMEZU
10	came to select you?
11	A No, I didn't.
12	Q Did he tell you that you were selected by
13	General UMEZU on the recommendation of himself, Mr.
14	YUZAWA?
15	A No, he did not say anything in particular.
17	Q Had you ever worked for General UMEZU before
18	that time?
19	A No.
20	Q Prior to the time you became Chief of General
21	Affairs in July 1940, when were you last in Manchuria?
22	A From January 1935 to April 1938 I was in the
23	service of the Kwantung Government General in Hsinking,
24	and therefore the last time I was in Manchukuo was
25	April 1938.
	Q And from April 1938 until July 1940 you were not

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, Colonel Ivanov, you must not interrupt. I put the question to the witness and he must answer it.

(To the Witness) Can you answer yes or no the question that has just been read to you by the court reporter?

THE WITNESS: I shall reply.

THE PRESIDENT: Do so.

THE WITNESS: General UMEZU made it his duty to maintain defense, and I should like to add my explanation.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I think you have already added it.

THE PRESIDENT: If you don't want the explanation you need not press it. We can regard the question as one he refuses to answer under the circumstances because he hasn't expressed any inability to answer.

MR. BLAKENEY: I don't wish any further answer.

I think the answer given speaks for itself.

Q Now, sometime earlier you started to speak of Kan-Toku-en, that is, the Kwantung Army special maneuver.

COLONEL IVANOV: As far as I understand, the
Tribunal permitted the witness not only to answer the
question but also to give his explanation, not only to
answer yes or no, and I consider the defense has no right

No, that does not follow.

2 3

1

Occupation Army did in the way of preparations accord-

4

ing to the Kantokuen?

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Have you told us now all that the Mongolia

A I can't understand the meaning of your question. May I have it repeated?

The meaning of my question is, have you now told to the Tribunal all of the things which you spoke of in your affidavit as being preparations made by the Mongolia Stationary Army according to the Kantokuen Plan for attack against the U.S.S.R.?

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, in reply to the question asked by the defense counsel, the witness has quite positively stated that the Kantokuen plan had no connection whatsoever with the measures taken by the Japanese Army in Inner Mongolia. However, the defense counsel, in formulating his question, is persistently pointing out that the measures taken in Inner Mongolia were conducted under the Kantokuen Plan.

I do not know whether such questions are admissible in an international court, but in our Soviet courts such questions are inadmissible, both with regard to the esamination of the accused and examination of the witnesses.

MR. BLAKENEY: I have been very careful to use

Army for liaison purposes?

A Yes.

Q And, you knew those facts by reason of having deciphered the message announcing his impending arrival?

A Yes, as you say.

Q And, he did come, didn't he?

A Yes.

Q And, he had a meeting with the commander of the Mongolian Army?

A Yes.

Q You, however, weren't present at the meeting?

A Of course not.

Q You didn't know what was said or talked about at the meeting?

A Of course I didn't.

Q In fact, this time you weren't even told by any captain what they talked about, were you?

A No.

Q But, you assume that it had to do with plans for aggression against the U.S.S.R., don't you?

A I gained the impression from the war situation between Germany and Russia and also from the general atmosphere then prevailing.

Q And, that is one of the facts from which you

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

designed to attack his credibility. 1 THE PRESIDENT: Some of my colleagues have the 2 view that you are really arguing with the witness, 3 Major Blakeney. 4 MR. BLAKENEY: If it is argument to ask him 5 to explain a patent contradiction, sir, porhaps I am. 6 THE PRESIDENT: If he contradicts himself 7 you may well leave the cross-examiniation pass. Ordinarily, counsel getting a contradiction would stop cross-examination at that point unless he wanted to 10 be very fair to the witness. If that is your purpose 11 you may insist on an enswer and the question will be 12 allowed. 13 MR. BLAKENEY: I might say that that has not 14 been the practice in the jurisdictions with which I am familiar and which, therefore, is the only practice that I know. But I will leave that matter. Did this Colonel ONO, the chief signal officer, 19 did he attend staff conferences of the Kwantung Army 20 relating to operations plans, operations matters? Naturally he has attended them. 21 22 0 Regularly? 23 A Yes. 24 Did the chief of the cipher section attend 25 them?

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Q What was the approximate strength of the Soviet forces in the Far East at the beginning of the winter of 1943?

COLONEL IVANOV: This is repetitive and outside of the scope of his affidavit.

CROSS

MR. BLAKENEY: It has never been mentioned before, and if you will look on page 6 of the affidavit, end of paragraph 4, you will find some comparison of the strength of the two armies.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection overruled.

A I, myself, have no sufficient knowledge as to the strength of the Soviet forces at that time.

Q Witness, you know very well, don't you, that the decision to wage war is one that is not made by captains and majors and cryptographic clerks? It is not made by the Kwantung Army; it is not made even by the Imperial General Headquarters; but it is made as a matter of national policy on a much higher plane.

colonal IVANOV: The Court repeatedly drew attention of the parties not to make long preliminary statements to the questions. Besides, this question is of no purpose in connection with this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Objections upheld.

Q And if any such national policy was ever decided it was never confided to you by anyone

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

```
COLONEL IVANOV: May the witness be shown
 exhibit 722?
                 (Whereupon, a document was handed
 3
      to the witness.)
           Is that your affidavit and did you sign it?
 5
      A
          Yes.
          Are the contents thereof true and correct?
          Yes, true and correct.
 8
          Did you give your testimony truthfully and
without any duress?
     A I wrote this from my own conscience, volun-
Werily.
13
          COLONUL IVANOV: If the Tribunal please,
Hoparate exceprts from exhibit 722 have been read in
bourt, and they are at page 7,575 of the record.
With the Tribunal's permission, I shall read one
question and one answer from exhibit 722, which were
from the affidavit of MURAKAMI, which haven't been
read before. It is at the bottom of page 3 of the
English text and at the top of page 4 of the same
21
text:
22
     "Q. What were the tasks of the Research
23
Institute of Total Mobilization in 1943?
     "A. First, we were interested in the maxi-
mum increase of the production of aircraft and
```

1	that was so that it may have been that number.
2	Q And after 1944 no student was admitted and
3	the activities of the Institute ceased, is that correct?
4	A Yes, you are right.
5	MR. BLEWETT: That is all, your Honor, thank y
6	THE PRESIDENT: Apparently there is no further
7	cross-examination.
8	Colonel Ivanov.
9	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
10	BY COLONEL IVANOV.
11	Q I ask that the witness be shown exhibits 690
12	and 688-A.
13	(Whereupon, two documents were
14	handed to the witness.)
15	Q Witness, will you take a glance at these
16	documents and tell us which of these studies were
17	made under the instruction of TOJO?
18	A What General TOJO requested was a study of
19	what I have in my hand, this document; and his request
20	was that a general study be made as to the administration
21	of occupied areas.
22	Q Will you name the number of this exhibit?

A Well, there are two numbers on this document:

It appears on the cover of the book.

24 25

1355 and 690.

Q This is exhibit 690.
THE PRESIDENT: A?

Q Tell us, witness, to which document was the counsel for the accused TOJO referring in his cross-examination, which of these documents that you have now before you?

A Well, I don't exactly understand the meaning of the question, but I don't think that the counsel for His Excellency TOJO asked me any question in connection with this book, or this document.

So, did I understand you correctly that you stated here that the counsel for the accused TOJO did not ask you a single question concerning the document which was worked out in accordance with instructions by the accused TOJO?

A That is how I think.

Q. Will you tell us what part was played by the lectures on the spiritual education of the students, and what part was played by the research work which was carried out under your guidance?

A Well, there is this question of proportion or ratio between spirit and matter, and the question of the national concept of the Japanese State was undertaken as a spiritual study and from a spiritual angle; but from the point of view of quantity, I should say that

much work was done, that is, there were more studies

```
1 so far as quantity was concerned.
              THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half
3 past nine tomorrow morning.
                    (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
 4
        was taken until Thursday, 30 October 1947 at
         0930.)
 6
10
11
12
14
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

BATARSHIN

1

2

4

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

23

22

24 25 MR. FURNESS: I ask that the map as marked by the witness be given an exhibit number for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: You can tender it finally, if I understand the position correctly, but you want it for identification.

MR. FURNESS: I want to see it first, your Honor, and I plan to have other marks made on it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what I tell you is the ordinary rule, and my Colleagues take that view, too. But, for the time being, you can tender it for identification, but the other side can insist on it being tendered finally.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, as my colleague has started the cross-examination in the manner of a quizz, and as I don't want that the tests put to the witness be kept in secret, I ask that the map be tendered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it must go in, so mark it finally.

MR. FURNESS: Mark it finally. I have no objection.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Photostatic copy of original tracing of map, which is exhibit 2175, will receive exhibit No. 3373.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3373 and received in evidence.) THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

- 1 K a 2 p e a

u & K

n 9

10

11

12

13 14

> 15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I believe that the paper which the witness marked was a photostat of the tracing, that is, exhibit 3373. I also have the original tracing which has attached to it a certificate of an expert drawer of maps which perhaps should be offered now to give it further authenticity as to its arcuracy.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you tender it, then? MR. FURNESS: I will now offer it. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Original tracing of map, which is exhibit No. 2175, will receive exhibit No. 3373-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3373-A and received in evidence.) BY MR. FURNESS (Continued):

Now, would you mark on that map, for the Court's benefit, the one that you marked in red pencil, the hill Zaozernaya and the hill that you refer to in your affidavit as Bezjimjannaya? Mark Zaozernaya with a "Z" and Bezjimjannaya with a "B".

W h e & M

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's permission the accused OKA will be absent from the courtroom for the whole of the afternoon session conferring with his counsel.

Major Furness.

10 11

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

BATARSHIN, called as a GILFAN A: witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified through Russian interpreters as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. FURNESS: May I ask that the last question and answer be read?

(Whereupon, the question and answer were read by the official court reporter as follows:)

"Q Where these guns were put and the troops were concentrated.

"A The Japanese were concentrating their forces around the Hamoka village -- in the Hamoka village

NOTE:

Col. hedligham The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

Khunchun. I want to know your opinion. "

Do you know anything about this incident?

A Colonel Grebennik, commander of the detachment, reported to me -- told me as an officer that such an occurrence was somewhat to the north of the Zaozernaya Hill.

THE RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: We spell the name of the colonel, G-r-e-b-e-n-n-i-k.

Q Now, was this the same letter regarding which you testified in your affidavit?

A This is the second letter.

Q But the gist of the letter which I have just read to you is the same as the letter which you remember having been told about by this Grebennik?

A Yes, it is approximately so.

Q Now, did the Soviet frontier guards dig any entrenchments, string any barb wire, or build any other military fortifications in this area prior to July 29?

A Prior to July 29 the border guards constructed no fortifications there.

Q And there remained during that period only 30 border guards on that hill?

A Originally there were fewer border guards, but since the 16th there were 30 border guards.

0

12

10

11

2

3

4

5

7

14

16 17

18

20 21

22

23 24

"13. In exhibit 227, I, as Vice-War Minister, received an advice from the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army dated June 4, 1932 with respect to the taking over of the Dairen Customs, and I reported to the War Minister about it. But as at this time the government had not decided a policy concerning customs and as it was a matter which could not be carried out by the Army alone no action was taken thereon.

"14. I will now explain the use made of the funds mentioned in exhibit 2210. The sum of 20,000 yen turned over to me as Vice Minister of War on 4 July, 1932, was handled under my supervision by the Senior Adjutant of the War Ministry and the Secretariat Pay-Master and was used to defray expenses for social occasions held at the Minister's official residence and in the Ministry itself, for incidental expenses of various bureaus and sections of the Ministry and to pay persons employed temporarily.

"15. I was transferred to Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army on 8 August, 1932 and therefore I turned the sum of 18,500 yen, given to me as Vice War Minister, which is stated in Court exhibit 2211, over to Lt. General YANAGAWA, Heismke, my successor in office, and I do not know how it was used.

"16. The sum of 1,970,000 yen, turned over

7 8

KOISO 32,312

from the USSR as well as certain other witnesses.

General Zaryanov contends that the three Russian nationals must necessarily have included Budarin because there was no way of making up three without him.

On the 17th of June an order was made in open court for the production of all witnesses who had not then been produced. That order was wide enough to include Budarin if he were one of the three Russian nationals. Later, the Chief Prosecutor filed an application asking that the time for the production of the itnesses be extended. application he named Budarin among others. The application came before me in Chambers on the 20th of August. Major Furness and Major Blakeney were present according to the record. I read the names of the witnesses, including Budarin. General Vasiliev also mentioned Budarin in his remarks. Major Blakeney spoke at considerable length, but nobody pointed out that Budarin was not required, and the Chief Prosecutor's application was granted in toto.

We will hear your reply after the recess.
We will recess for fifteen minutes.

MR. FURNESS: May I say that Major Blakeney is not here; and, if his name was mentioned, it should

1 2

4

5

7

9

10 11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

22

23 24

коіѕо 32,315

of the introduction into evidence of the documents, respectively were the witnesses Batarshin and Chernopyatko and the former Foreign Commissar Litvinov, excerpts from whose diary were introduced in evidence and whose production for cross-examination was requested on page 7,718 of the record, that having been on the 14th of October, 1946. As I have said, however, in presenting argument on the motion for production of witnesses, I did specify by name those who were then desired and I confined the argument to those who had given affidavits and whom we desired. And in naming the witnesses desired I named the two Soviet witnesses who have already appeared within the past week, Batarshin and Chernopyatko.

The order of the Tribunal was entered on the 17th of June at page 24,517 of the record. In that order, after naming specifically five witnesses and disposing of their peculiar cases on other grounds, the Tribunal continued as follows: "That it orders" -- I am quoting -- "That it orders the prosecution to produce for cross-examination the other witnesses mentioned in the said defense motion."

As I have said, the witness Budarin was not mentioned in the said defense motion. I, therefore, have assumed then, as I assumed at all later times, that

коізо 32,316

the witness Budarin was not included within the tenor of the order of the Tribunal. And, parenthetically, the production of the witness Budarin was not requested when his affidavit was produced, was tendered, which I assume would be the only appropriate time for entering such a request.

Notwithstanding that the defense had and has never requested the production of this witness, it now appears that when the prosecution moved on the 19th of August, or two days after the order of the Tribunal of the 17th of June had by its terms become effective, for an extension of time, it appears, I say, that the name of the witness Budarin was included among those for whom it was desired that an extension of time be granted before their production. In Chambers it was I who responded to the application and I can say only that I gave no thought to the question of the addition by the prosecution of the name of another witness than those already requested by the defense. I thought then and I think now that if the matter then being agitated was of an extension of time within which to produce witnesses requested by the defense, that the request of the defense should govern in the matter of what witnesses were under discussion.

I, therefore, submit to the Tribunal that not only

4

6

7

8

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

that MATSUI composed the poem in Nanking on New Years 1 Day. 2 MR. MATTICE: My copy reads "showed me." 3 THE PRESIDENT: He may have read it over in 4 Shanghai, certainly. That's clear now. So the wit-5 ness says. 6 What occurred with respect to this poem in 0 7 Shanghai? 8 What do you mean by that? A 9 Well, what, if anything, occurred with re-10 spect to the poem? How did you come to see it? 11 On New Years Day, 1938, I made a courtesy 12 call on General MATSUI. It was customary for the 13 General to compose a poem on every New Years Day, and 14 on this particular occasion he showed me the poem he 15 had composed that morning. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Is he purporting to read from 17 his affidavit in Japanese? 18 THE WITNESS: No, I am not. 19 THE PRESIDENT: I think we should refer that 20 original affidavit in Japanese to the Language Section. 21 MR. MATTICE: I have an additional question 22 or two at this time. 23

24

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

ers before the fighting at Nanking began?

Where did General MATSUI have his headquart-

1	TADAO YOKOI, called as a witness on behalf
1	of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified
2	through Japanese interpreters as follows:
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI:
5	Q What is your name and address, Witness?
7	A YOKOI, Tadao, 2327 Midori-ga-oka, Meguro-ku,
8	Tokyo.
	MR. SHIMANOUCHI: May the witness be shown
9	defense document No. 2671?
10	(Whereupon, a document was handed to the
11	witness.)
12	Q Is that your affidavit?
13 14	A Yes,
15	Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
16	A Yes.
17	MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I offer in evidence defense
18	document 2761.
19	ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in
20	evidence.
21	CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2671 wil
22	receive exhibit No. 3507.
23	(Whereupon, the document above
24	referred to was marked defense exhibit
25	No. 3507 and received in evidence.)

TADAO YOKOI, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI: Q What is your name and address, Witness?	
through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI:	
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI:	
BY MR. SHIMANOUCHI:	
Q What is your name and address, Witness?	
A YOKOI, Tadao, 2327 Midori-ga-oka, Meguro-ku,	
Tokyo.	
MR. SHIMANOUCHI: May the witness be shown	
defense document No. 2671?	
(Whereupon, a document was handed to the	
witness.)	
Q Is that your affidavit?	
A Yes.	
Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?	
A Yes.	
MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I offer in evidence defense	
document 2761.	
ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in	
evidence.	
CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2671 wi	1
receive exhibit No. 3507.	
(Whereupon, the document above	
referred to was marked defense exhibit	

No. 3507 and received in evidence.)

```
cannot say for sure whether there was anything else
  dded to this telegram or whether parts of this
  telegram are exactly as represented here.
           MR. TAVENNER: Just a moment. I offer in
  evidence IPS document 3271.
           MR. CUNNINGHAM: Just a minute, please.
 7 I should like to object for the same reasons that I
s bjected to the other document and for the further
greas n that there is no certification here that this
10 came from any authentic source and the witness not
11 having authenticated it. Therefore, under our rules
12 heretofore applied, it is objectionable as evidence
13 at this time.
14
           ACTING PRESIDENT: The whole purport of the
  document was admitted by the witness. The same rul-
  ing as on the previous document. The objection is
  overruled and the document admitted in a vidence.
18
           CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
19
  3271 will receive exhibit 3515.
20
              (Whoreupon, the document above
21
       referred to was marked prosecution exhibit
22
       N. 3515 and received in evidence.)
23
           MR. TAVENNER: I will read exhibit 3515:
24
           "Explanation concerning War Ministry tele-
25
  gram, No. 236:
```

gram, No. 236:

cannot say for sure whether there was anything else added to this telegram or whether parts of this telegram are exactly as represented here. MR. TAVENNER: Just a moment. I offer in evidence IPS document 3271. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Just a minute, please. 7 I should like to object for the same reasons that I s bjected to the other document and for the further 9 reason that there is no certification here that this 10 came from any authentic source and the witness not 11 having authenticated it. Therefore, under our rules 12 heretofore applied, it is objectionable as evidence 13 at this time. 14 ACTING PRESIDENT: The whole purport of the document was admitted by the witness. The same ruling as on the previous document. The objection is 17 overruled and the document admitted in a vidence. 18 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 19 3271 will receive exhibit 3515. 20 (Whoreupon, the document above 21 referred to was marked prosecution exhibit 22 No. 3515 and received in evidence.) MR. TAVENNER: I will read exhibit 3515: 24 "Explanation concerning War Ministry tele-25

CROSS

in July, 1939?

2 3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

Yes, he was.

Do you recall, and is it not a fact, that some. time in July Captain ENDO made an explanation of the position of the Japanese Navy in regard to the strengthening of the Anti-Comintern Pact to the Chief Secretary of the German Navy Ministry, wherein he stated that if war should break out between Germany-Italy and Ingland-France it would be fine if Japan maintained a friendly neutrality, and that upon learning of this from Captain ENDO you became very angry and inquired of Stahmer if Ribbentrop knew that?

- No, that is not so.
- What of ice in Germany was held by Wiehl? Q
- He was Director of the Connerce Trade Bureau.
- Did you have a conference with him in Berlin on 21 December 1938 in which he informed you that Ribbentrop insisted that preferred treatment be given Germany as compared with third powers in China, and that this should be stipulated in writing in the Pro-l'emoria regarding German-Japanese cooperation in China?
 - I have no recollection.
- Let me see if I can refresh your recollection. Did not Wiehl stress in that conference the fact that

Germany was entitled to a preferential treatment, not

1 2

3

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

17

18

20

22

24

A No, he was not.

Q Just a moment -- and you advised him to express his views clearly to MATSUOKA, didn't you?

A No. If I were to give him any advice or express my views I would first have to know the contents of the German proposal and what MATSUOKA said in regard thereto.

Q Well, didn't you advise him to express his views clearly to MATSUOKA?

A No, that was not an advice. I made just such a reply to a question that he put to me, in the course of the conversation.

Q Then you are drawing a distinction between advising him to do a thing and telling him to do it?

A No, I am not making any distinctions, necessarily. But I am stating that I gave him no advice. I do not think that I gave him any advice.

THE INTERPRETER: I will repeat the last answer given by the witness:

A I am not making any distinctions necessarily. I am only saying that I do not have any feeling I gave any advice.

Q Was MATSUOKA or either of the diplomatic councilors of the Foreign Office -- SHIRATORI and SAITO -- present at this conference at the German 2

1

4 5

6

8

9

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

20

21 22

23 24

25

but at that time I did not realize that there were as many opponents to such a pact as I learned through the information presented before this Tribunal.

- Q Now, what reans were used by the leaders in the Japanese Government to silence this opposition?
 - A Being an outsider, I knew nothing.
- Q Well, is it not true that you do know that on Imperial edict was secured which had the effect of compelling the Japanese nation to follow the provisions of the Tripartite Alliance, and didn't you so inform Hitler or Ribbentrop?

A No, I made no such report, but I think it was only natural that the Imperial Rescript expressed the inclination of the people at large -- no, I made no such report, but this Imperial Rescript was used for the purpose of uniting the people as one, and of this fact I informed the leaders of Germany upon my return to that country.

- Q Did you advise that the Emperor be used in this manner?
- A Being an outsider, I had no connection with such matters.
- Q Exhibit 562, page 6,429 of the transcript, is a telegram from Ambassador Ott of 31 January 1939, in which it is stated, "Unity of government and nation

allowed to make a copy. In the present case, however, an extraordinary occasion arose, in which the witness, as compiler of the "History of the Manchurian Incident", was authorized to make as many copies as he liked.

If any of the copies so made in the course of his duty remains today and is identified by him as such, is it not the next best evidence, in the absence of the original, and as authentic as any copy attested by a Government office? This is not the present case and in the absence of the original or copies, these statements from two different sources attest to what were in the original telegrams and were made before one of the highest international tribunals of the time.

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that the whole matter rests upon the credibility of the witness, as to what he has previously testified to, which may be attacked by means of cross-examination, but not by the objection to the admissibility of evidence as to what was in the originals, not in copies, but in the originals.

As to relevancy and materiality of the telegrams embodied in these copies, it goes without saying that they have a great bearing on MINAMI's case. Although some of them show the attitude of the General Staff, which did not exactly concur with that of the

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

2 3

M or see & Whalen

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except MATSUI who is represented by counsel. We have a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo certifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

AKIRA MUTO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. HOZUMI: I should like to continue my questions which I began yesterday.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Proceed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

16 BY MR. HOZUMI (Continued):

Q Just before the recess you told me that General TOJO proceeded to the Palace without any knowledge of his of being ordered to form a cabinet. Was your answer complete or have you anything to add to that statement?

A I have completed my reply.

Q I shall proceed to the next question.

ACTING PRESIDENT: There is a loose connection.

THE INTERPRETER: Mr. Witness, just before the recess you said that General TOJO proceeded to the Palace

1.27

19

21

22

23

MUTO 33,237

AKIRA MUTO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I regret to advise you that upon doctor's orders Mr. Lopez will not continue the cross-examination of this witness. If it is the Tribunal's pleasure, Mr. English will continue with the cross-examination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, I sincerely regret the illness of Mr. Lopez and I don't, under any circumstances, want to extract any advantage from it. I mean no discourtesy to him or to the prosecution in general in making objection to the proposed procedure.

The cross-examination of the accused has alread been interrupted and further or continuation of that interruption will certainly harm no one. The Tribunal has already ruled very definitely in regard to cross-examination of any witness, let alone an accused, by more than one prosecutor. The latest instance of which I am aware is that which arose in the case of the accused ITAGAKI at which time the Tribunal refused a similar request on record page 30,485. Briefly, I feel that it is a distinct disadvantage not alone to

ZENSHIRO HOSHINA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SOMIYA: Witness, state your name and address to the Tribunal.

My name is HOSHINA, Zenshiro. My address is

No. 959 Tamagawa Nakamachi, 1-Chome, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo.

MR. SOMIYA: May the witness be shown defense document No. 2737?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.

Is that your affidavit, made by you?

Yes.

Are the contents thereof true and correct? 0

Yes.

MR. SOMIYA: I present in evidence defense document No. 2737.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Mr. President and Members of the Tritunal, the prosecution has no objection to defense document 2737 except to paragraph 4 at page 2. The ground of the objection is that this statement is not a statement of fact but is merely the opinion and

2 3

. 1

8

1 7

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24

ZENSHIRO HOSHINA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SOMIYA:

Q Witness, state your name and address to the Tribunal.

A My name is HOSHINA, Zenshiro. My address is No. 959 Tamagawa Nakamachi, 1-Chome, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo.

MR. SOMIYA: May the witness be shown defense document No. 2737?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Is that your affidavit, made by you?

A Yes.

Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?

A Yes.

MR. SOMIYA: I present in evidence defense document No. 2737.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Mr. President and Members of the Tritunal, the prosecution has no objection to defense document 2737 except to paragraph 4 at page 2. The ground of the objection is that this statement is not a statement of fact but is merely the opinion and

2

. 1

4

6

7 8

9

10

12

14

16

18

20

21 22

23

conclusion of the witness on an issue which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of this Tribunal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is that your only objection? CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Yes, it is.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained as to paragraph 4; otherwise the document will be admitted into evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2737 will receive exhibit No. 3468.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3468 and received in evidence.)

MR. SOMIYA: I now read exhibit 3468:

"1. I am former Vice Admiral in the Navy. I was Chief of Military Preparations Bureau, Navy Ministry, from November 15, 1940 to May 1945. On May 15, 1945, I assumed the post of Chief of Naval Affairs Bureau, and held that position up to November 17, 1945. Therefore, I am familiar with the duties of Chief of Naval Affairs Bureau.

"2. The Naval Affairs Bureau, as set forth in the government-established organization of Navy Ministry, like other bureaus in the Navy Ministry, is subject to the commands and orders of the Navy Minister, and functions under the direct supervision of the Vice Navy

2

3

.

6

7

9

10

11

1.2

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

22

24

SHIBA

anyone else with regard to dropping your proposed amendment from the note that was to go to the United States?

CROSS

A Yes.

Q Therefore, you gave up without protest your belief that the note in the form in which it later actually was sent to the United States was not an ultimatum, not in accordance with yours and Admiral OKA's belief that Japan must fight fairly and aboveboard. Is not that the result of the statement that you presented in your affidavit?

MR. ROBERTS: I object on the ground that this is apparently a statement -- not a question. If it is a question it has already been answered by the witness.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection sustained.

Q Just one further question. You stated a moment ago, Mr. Witness, that you did not have in mind the German ultimatum of 1914, that is, the Japanese ultimatum to Germany in 1914, when you proposed this amendment. I have just one question on that point.

Was your failure to take into consideration the ultimatum of Japan to Germany of August 1914 due to your lack of knowledge about that ultimatum or due Wolf & Lefie

Page 1, paragraph 13 of the affidavit, the sentence beginning "As the War Minister" down to "diplomatic matters:" exhibit 1104, page 10,081; exhibit 2219, page 15,841; exhibit 2218, page 15,837; exhibit 2216, page 15,832.

Again, page 17, paragraph beginning "As for the problems" down to "independence:" exhibit 1104, page 10,081.

Same page, paragraph beginning "These explanations" down to "Nations: same exhibit.

page 19 -- I am not quite sure in which of the sections on this page that part is. It is either the end of 13 or the beginning of 14 -- paragraph beginning "Standing from the League" down to witnesses: "exhibit 2222, page 15,845.

Page 20, section 14-A, paragraph beginning "To cope with this" down to "Soviet Union:" exhibit 668, page 7,332; exhibit 670, page 7,331.

Page 20 again, second section,
paragraph beginning "I do not admit" down to
"expression:" exhibit 746, page 7,720; exhibit 747
page 7,727; exhibit 671-A, page 7,336;

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

present the to prose this reason of the property

I beg your pardon -- page 35, section 24, paragraph beginning "My duty as Education Minister" down to "meeting;" exhibits 2218, page 15,837; 2219, page 15,841; 271, page 3,640; 1291, page 11,695; 491, page 6037.

2761 will receive exhibit No. 3470.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3470 and received in evidence.)

MR. ROBERTS: I shall read exhibit 3470, omitting the formal parts:

"I was a former Admiral in the Navy. I was appointed Navy Minister in the Third KONOYE Cabinet on July 18, 1941, and served in that capacity until the said Cabinet resigned on October 16, 1941.

During my tenure of office, OKA, Takazumi, was the Director of the Naval Affairs Bureau.

the Imperial Headquarters and the Government. This was a gathering of the high ranking men in the Supreme Command, that is, Chief of Army General Staff, Chief of Naval General Staff, Deputy Chiefs of both Staffs and the Cabinet Ministers, representing the Government, in order to bring about an understanding between the political functions and the Supreme Command. The meeting was not formally arranged, the discussions were informal, and no votes were taken. The matters which were unanimously agreed upon at the Liaison Conference were carried out by Government organs or the Supreme

1 2

7 8

2761 will receive exhibit No. 3470.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3470 and received in evidence.)

MR. ROBERTS: I shall read exhibit 3470,

MR. ROBERTS: I shall read exhibit 3470, omitting the formal parts:

"I was a former Admiral in the Navy. I was appointed Navy Minister in the Third KONOYE Cabinet on July 18, 1941, and served in that capacity until the said Cabinet resigned on October 16, 1941.

During my tenure of office, OKA, Takazumi, was the Director of the Naval Affairs Bureau.

"I attended the Liaison Conferences between the Imperial Headquarters and the Government. This was a gathering of the high ranking men in the Supreme Command, that is, Chief of Army General Staff, Chief of Naval General Staff, Deputy Chiefs of both Staffs and the Cabinet Ministers, representing the Government, in order to bring about an understanding between the political functions and the Supreme Command. The meeting was not formally arranged, the discussions were informal, and no votes were taken. The matters which were unanimously agreed upon at the Liaison Conference were carried out by Government organs or the Supreme

1 2

MR. ROBERTS: It is a correction merely, your Honor.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All right, you can correct it at the proper time.

BY CAPTAIN ROBINSON:

Q Now a final question, Mr. Witness:
You refer in your affidavit, at page 4, to
Prince KONOYE and the navy. At the middle of the
page you state, and I quote your words:

"Needless to say, the navy did all it could to avoid war with the United States. And this sentiment among naval circles was communicated to Premier KONOYE"; and dropping down a few sentences:

"As the Prime Minister too" -- that is, KONOYE -
"was of exactly the same opinion as the navy..."

Now, as a matter of fact, is it not true that Prince KONOYE on or about October 16, 1941, the day when his cabinet, including yourself, went out of office, said this? "It is indeed cowardly of the navy not to avow its opposition to war with America."

A I have never heard of Prince KONOYE making such a statement.

Q And are you aware, Mr. Witness, of the fact that the defendant KIDO stated in this courtroom, upon cross-examination by the Chief of Counsel, that the

2

1

4

3

6

7 8

9

11

13

14 15

16

18

19 20

21

22

24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution first objects to the long and detailed statement made by counsel in presenting this document.

THE PRESIDENT: It would save reading it if it is admitted, of course.

MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, I submit there is nothing that I could not have said on an opening statement, and I did not intend to read it. That is why I made the statement.

MR. SUTTON: The prosecution objects to this document on the ground that it is immaterial and irrelevant to any of the issues involved in this case. Had the document been pertinent, it should have been tendered in the general phase. The Tribunal has heretofore rejected evidence tending to prove the circumstances surrounding the use of the atomic bomb, record page 17,655 to 17,662.

MR. BROOKS: The Court will notice this is not confined to the atomic bomb alone, and it is specifically covering the period of KOISO's holding office as Premier from 1944. It does not cover the years from 1928 to 1945, the end of the war.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

as the motion and perhaps longer, because of what I consider to be the numerous misstatements of fact which must be corrected by references to the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you make any exception of KITA's case?

MR. BLAKENEY: Exceptions?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Are you objecting to the production of his affidavit or to its being used, seeing that he is dead according to the evidence before us?

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, of course, we do object to the reception of that affidavit as well as others in similar case, some of which the Tribunal ruled would be accepted de bene esse.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think we are quite prepared to give you till Monday morning to reply.

MR. BLAKENEY: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal would like to know why it is not possible to have any witness, any affiant, who is still alive produced here in Tokyo.

I know security reasons have been stated, but we need some amplification of that.

I know how absolute in our own courts such a pronouncement would be by, say, a foreign secretary or a person of that standing, but here in this Court

7 8

1 2

2

5

6

7

9

11

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

22

23

25

MR. BROOKS: Now, if the Tribunal please, at this time I wish to refer to the counts of the Indictment in which MINAMI is not named.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I don't see how that is material at this time, Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: I have not concluded, your Honor, the presentation of MINAMI's case. We only postponed it for this.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Nevertheless, in my submission this is a matter for summation and not to be dealt with here today.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You can refer us to certain pages of the transcript or something of that kind, but so far as the various counts of the Indictment are concerned, that is not material at this time. It is a question for summation.

MR. BROOKS: I am making this reference to the counts in which MINAMI is not charged in the Indictment for the reason that I am not offering evidence on these counts, although the prosecution in certain instances has made references to evidence in matters in which the accused has not been charged, and I think --

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is a matter for argument in your summation.

The point deals with the wholly erroneous contention that the order of June 17 was a final decision for rejection of affidavits as to which the deponents were not produced for cross-examination. May I be permitted to make a rebuttal reply to this new point?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Go ahead.

MR. TAVENNER: Certainly counsel, who at his request was given from Thursday until today to prepare his reply, must know and understand that the order of June 17 was not final.

It is divided into two parts. The first part orders the prosecution to produce for cross-examination certain witnesses within a period of two months, or within such longer period as may on cause shown be approved by the Tribunal.

The second part is that, alternatively, that is, if the deponents are not produced, the prosecution shall give convincing reasons within the said period as to why they are not able to produce the witnesses.

The language of this alternative provision of the order is meaningless unless it means precisely what it says, namely, that the prosecution may be heard on the reasons why it is not able to produce certain witnesses, and it is incomprehensible that counsel should seriously contend otherwise.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

,

MR. COLE: I will read exhibit 3441.
"I, JAMES EDWARD WALSH, being first duly

sworn, on oath, depose and say:
"That I am now, and was at all times herein

mentioned, a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church belonging to and affiliated with the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, also known as the Maryknoll Society; that at the time of the happening of the occurrence of the facts herein related I was Superior General of the said Maryknoll Society;

"That General MUTO, Akira occupied the position of Director of the Central Bureau of Military Affairs, with his office in Tokyo, at the time when I made his acquaintance. The following statement contains the facts that are known to me regarding the part taken by General MUTO in the peace negotiations of 1941.

"1. In late November, 1940, Father James M. Drought of Maryknoll (since deceased) and the undersigned were in Japan. While in Tokyo, we were asked by Mr. MATSUOKA, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, if we would take a message to Washington to the effect that the Japanese Government wished to negotiate a peace agreement. As far as I recall, Mr. MATSUOKA was not very definite about the terms of such an

agreement. We were told by other officials and spokesmen that the Japanese Government proposed as basic terms of the agreement on their part: (1) a guarantee to nullify their participation in the Axis Pact, if not public repudiation, at least in some definite manner that would be effective and complete, and (2) a guarantee to recall all military forces from China and to restore to China its geographical and political integrity. Other conditions bearing on the relations of Japan and the United States were to be explored and agreed upon in the conversations that it was hoped would ensue. These additional conditions, largely economic in nature, were also discussed with us; by Mr. MATSUOKA to some little extent, but at greater length and with more detail by other representatives of the Japanese Government, among whom Mr. Tadao IKAWA (since deceased) known to us as a friend and unofficial representative of the then Prime Minister, Prince KONOYE (also since deceased) was the most assiduous. Father Drought carried on most of the conversations, as I was largely occupied with missionary affairs.

"... We agreed to take the message, provided

proportion for the things of the arms of the same of the same

23

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

that some assurances would be forthcoming from representatives of the Japanese Army and Navy regarding the Japanese unanimity of purpose in reaching an agreement and carrying it out.

"My line-a-day diary records the fact that Father Drought and the undersigned were introduced to General MUTO by Tadao IKAWA on December 27, 1940.

General MUTO was then Chief of the Central Bureau of

Military Affairs. We met him at his office in Tokyo. He did not appear to speak English, and neither Father Drought nor the undersigned understood Japanese. Accordingly, General MUTO spoke in Japanese, and Mr. IKAWA translated his statements into English for us then and there. I, the undersigned, made no record of the conversation at the time, and I cannot pretend to recall now with complete precision the exact words that General MUTO used. I recall distinctly, however, the substance of what General MUTO said, particularly the following statements: (1) that he and his associates in the Japanese Army were in accord with the efforts to reach a peace agreement, and (2) that he would do all in his power to further and assist the efforts to conclude a peace agreement. From this interview Father Drought and I received the impression that General MUTO was pledging himself -- and as far as it lay in his power, the Army he represented -- to concurrence in the proposed undertaking.

"I do not recall that the actual terms of the proposed agreement were discussed with General MUTO, although it is quite possible that they were. The interview lasted for some time -- perhaps twenty minutes, perhaps a half hour; the conversation was leisurely and fairly lengthy, and in its course various pertinent

1 2

4

3

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

18 19

20

22

23

points were touched upon. There may have been some mention of the terms. However, I am unable to assert of my own present knowledge that the terms were discussed. I have tried hard to recall this circumstance, but I possess no distinct recollection in regard to

this particular point.

"I seem to recall, though rather vaguely,
that Father Drought had seen some representative of the
Japanese Navy some days previously, and had received
a similar assurance on behalf of the Navy. I do not
recall who this representative of the Navy was, although
I think that Father Drought must have mentioned his
name to me at the time.

"It had been represented to us from the beginning, chiefly by Mr. IKAWA but also by others, that the peace proposals not only had the concurrence of the Prime Minister (Prince KONO/E), but were largely a matter of his initiation. We were told that we would be taken to see the Prime Minister before leaving, if we agreed to go to Washington. It was also made known to us that the proponents of the plan would feel more assurance if Father Drought and I both made the journey to Washington in person.

"Father Drought and I had booked tentatively on a ship to return to America. It was to sail from

points were touched upon. There may have been some mention of the terms. However, I am unable to assert of my own present knowledge that the terms were discussed. I have tried hard to recall this circumstance, but I possess no distinct recollection in regard to this particular point.

"I seem to recall, though rather vaguely,
that Father Drought had seen some representative of the
Japanese Navy some days previously, and had received
a similar assurance on behalf of the Navy. I do not
recall who this representative of the Navy was, although
I think that Father Drought must have mentioned his
name to me at the time.

"It had been represented to us from the beginning, chiefly by Mr. IKAWA but also by others, that the peace proposals not only had the concurrence of the Prime Minister (Prince KONO/E), but were largely a matter of his initiation. We were told that we would be taken to see the Prime Minister before leaving, if we agreed to go to Washington. It was also made known to us that the proponents of the plan would feel more assurance if Father Drought and I both made the journey to Washington in person.

"Father Drought and I had booked tentatively on a ship to return to America. It was to sail from

Yokohoma on December 28, 1940. The evening before the ship was to sail (later on the same day of our visit to General MUTO) we were taken to the Prime Minister's office in Tokyo to see him. The Prime Minister was out at the time of our call, and we sailed the next day (December 28th) without seeing him. Our ship was the Nitta Maru.

York, arriving there January 13, 1941. We got in touch with Mr. Hull, the Secretary of State, as promptly as we could. Mr. Hull arranged to have us explain the Japanese proposals in the presence of President Roosevelt and himself. On Thursday, January 23, 1941, we were in Washington, where we explained the matter to the best of our ability to the President and Mr. Hull. Mr. Frank C. Walker, the Postmaster General, was also present at the meeting, which took place in the President's office. The meeting lasted something like two and a half hours, perhaps slightly longer; and a lengthy explanation was given. The president and the Secretary of State thanked us for the trouble we had taken, and said they would take the matter under advisement.

"I believe it was shortly after this interview that our Government decided to investigate the Japanese proposals, and entered into some conversations with representatives of the Japanese Government relative to the matter.

3

5

7

9

11

13

15

17

30

18

20

22

23 24

25

"3. In June, 1941, I went again to Japan to resume my interrupted visitation of the Maryknoll missioners there and elsewhere in the Far East. I sailed from San Francisco on June 5 and arrived in Japan on June 19. I carried out a complete visitation of our missioners in Kyoto (Japan) and in Pyengyang (Korea). I wished to proceed to Fushun (Manchuria) for a similar visitation of our missioners there, but I was informed by the local police in Korea that I would not be allowed to proceed to Manchuria. No reason was given for the prohibition. I returned to Kyoto (Japan) and had not been long there when I was sought out by Mr. Tadao IKAWA. Mr. IKAWA had been sent to Washington to take part in the peace agreement conversations, and had now concluded his mission and returned to Japan. He informed me that the peace proposals had encountered difficulties, but that there was still some hope of a successful termination. He asked me if I would lend my assistance in continuing the negotiations, particularly in the matter of helping to get messages to and from the State Department in Washington and to and from the American Embassy in Tokyo. On reflection I replied that I would do so to the extent I considered proper,

representatives of the Japanese Government relative to the matter.

2

1

4

6

8

10

11

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

24

25

"3. In June, 1941, I went again to Japan to resume my interrupted visitation of the Maryknoll missioners there and elsewhere in the Far East. I sailed from San Francisco on June 5 and arrived in Japan on June 19. I carried out a complete visitation of our missioners in Kyoto (Japan) and in Pyengyang (Kores). I wished to proceed to Fushun (Manchuria) for a similar visitation of our missioners there, but I was informed by the local police in Korea that I would not be allowed to proceed to Manchuria. No reason was given for the prohibition. I returned to Kyoto (Japan) and had not been long there when I was sought out by Mr. Tadao IKAWA. Mr. IKAWA had been sent to Washington to take part in the peace agreement conversations, and had now concluded his mission and returned to Japan. He informed mo that the peace proposals had encountered difficulties, but that there was still some hope of a successful termination. He asked me if I would lend my assistance in continuing the negotiations, particularly in the matter of helping to get messages to and from the State Department in Washington and to and from the American Embassy in Tokyo. On reflection I replied that I would do so to the extent I considered proper,

if the American Embassy approved my doing so. This was in late August, 1941.

"On consulting Mr. Fugene Dooman at the American Embassy in Tokyo, I was advised that my cooperation in the capacity outlined might prove useful, and I understood that I was more or less encouraged to perform this little function of helping to transmit information when need arose. I understood also that Mr. Dooman consulted Mr. Grew, the Ambassador, about this procedure and obtained his approval for it.

"Mr. IKAWA and I then spent something like

two months in facilitating the exchange of information

and messages between the Japanese Government, on the

one hand, and the United States Government as represented by the State Department in Washington and the American

Embassy in Tokyo, on the other. There were many messages. All the messages for the State Department forwarded through my agency were sent by me by cablegram,

under my own name and in plain English, but concealed

under missionary phraseology, to Father Prought at

Maryknoll, New York, for transmission to the officials

of the State Department. All the messages for the

American Embassy in Tokyo were taken to the Embassy

personally by me and given to Mr. Eugene Dooman by word

of mouth.

"During this period I lived partly at the 2 Fujiya Hotel in Miyanoshita, and partly at the Beach 3 Hotel in Kamakura, sometimes in the company of Mr. 4 Tadao IKAWA and sometimes alone. Mr. IKAWA awakened 5 me very early one morning in the hotel at Miyanoshita 6 and said that he thought it would be safer if we changed our place of residence. He explained that some of the extremist elements might make trouble for us if we remained. I understood him to refer, not to the ordinary people but to the militaristic and pro-Nazi elements in the government or the army or both. I distinctly 12 recall Mr. IKAWA's statement at this time to the effect that General MUTO was protecting our activities and 13 would continue to do so to the best of his ability. 15 However, he also said that it was not possible to safe-16 guard us against every possible eventuality, so we re-17 moved at once to Kamakura. 18 "At Kamakura I continued for another month to 19

transmit messages in the manner already described. I did not see General MUTO during this period, nor again at any time ...

On October 14, 1941, I was asked by Mr. IKAWA if I would take another message from the Prime Minister (Prince KONOYE) to President Roosevelt in Washington. I said I would consider it. I went to

22

20

21

0

23 24

The reasons why certain witnesses could not be produced were explained first in the chambers hearing of August 20, and were restated by Chief of Counsel on October 16, the day before the witnesses were to be produced. Mr. Furness, who, with Mr. Blakeney, has been taking the lead in the defense opposition to this matter, said, on October 16, that he assumed, and I quote, "If the Court is considering changing its order, it will hear arguments from the defense with regard to it," the Tribunal having already announced that it would consider the matter.

The position of the prosecution is that the combined action of the prosecution, defense, and the Tribunal tolled the running of the time element of the order, and therefore the order did not become final. If the explanation as to why the prosecution is not able to produce the five, or I should say, six witnesses is considered adequate, then, it is submitted. the affidavit should be considered in evidence, and the order of June 17 will have been fully complied with. If the Tribunal concludes that convincing reasons have not been given for the non-production of the six witnesses, nevertheless, the prosecution respectfully submits, our Charter provisions and the Nuernberg rule should be held to govern. The prosecution

24 25

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ACTING PRESIDENT: Wait until the Tribunal gets copies.

CROSS

Proceed.

MR. LOPEZ: (Reading) "Strictly confidential.
Telegram sent by Chief of Military Affairs Bureau to
Colonel IWAKURO, 2 June.

"1. According to the information which is reportedly given by President Roosevelt to the Representatives of Congress, in his 'fireside chats,' the aim of the President in adopting a new conciliatory policy towards Japan is the transfer of the Pacific Fleet to the Atlantic Ocean. According to the said explanation, the U. S. seems to be possessed of a specially strong wishful thinking in judging that Japan will refuse to perform her duty of attacking the U. S. under the Tri-Partite Alliance even in case of the United States' entry into the war.

"2. In his 'fireside chats' he concluded that the European war had already developed into a world war and openly stated that the patrolling of the United States had been greatly strengthened and that every possible effort should be made in insuring that goods necessary to England reach her safely. At the same time, he expressed words of praise regarding Chiang Kai-shek for his continued resistance

document 2686.

3 on page 2.

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please, no objection except to the last sentence of paragraph 1, page 1, as being a conclusion; subparagraph 2 of paragraph 1 because it refers exclusively to HOSHINO; and, like-wise, to the second and third sentences of subparagraph

ACTING PRESIDENT: Would you repeat that last sentence again?

MR. LOPEZ: To the second and third sentences of subparagraph 3 on page 2.

ACTING PRESIDENT: There are only two sentences in the paragraph, that I can see.

MR. LOPEZ: Subparagraph 3 of paragraph 3, starting with the sentence, "They seemed to have had internal hardships..." until the words "...still deeply impressed on me," as being the conclusion and opinion of the witness.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is the HOSHINO referred to in subparagraph 2 of paragraph 1 one of the accused?

MR. COLE: Yes, that is right.

I will agree to omit the reading of those sentences objected to.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The affidavit will be admitted in evidence.

3

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

that if the Japan-American negotiations should be concluded, the emergency measures which had been taken would be cancelled and the situation would be restored to a normal condition. I remember it was in the middle of November that both chiefs of bureaus told me that although an instruction had already been issued to the dispatched troops, simultaneously with the conclusion of the negotiations, all emergency measures should be immediately stopped. They were making their best efforts in avoiding any fault in this respect,

You may cross-examine.

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please.

as this was a most difficult work to be smoothly carried

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOPEZ:

through."

Q You are the same YAMAMOTO, Chief of the American Bureau of the Foreign Office, who had constant telephonic conversations with KURUSU at Washington and you at Tokyo in October, November and December of 1941?

A Yes.

Q You constantly gave instructions to Ambassador KURUSU by telephone, using codes, did you not?

A I have contacted Ambassador KURUSU via the

1

3

4

6

.

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

that if the Japan-American negotiations should be concluded, the emergency measures which had been taken would be cancelled and the situation would be restored to a normal condition. I remember it was in the middle of November that both chiefs of bureaus told me that although an instruction had already been issued to the dispatched troops, simultaneously with the conclusion of the negotiations, all emergency measures should be immediately stopped. They were making their best efforts in avoiding any fault in this respect, as this was a most difficult work to be smoothly carried through."

You may cross-examine.

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOPEZ:

Q You are the same YAMAMOTO, Chief of the American Bureau of the Foreign Office, who had constant telephonic conversations with KURUSU at Washington and you at Tokyo in October, November and December of 1941?

A Yes.

Q You constantly gave instructions to Ambassador KURUSU by telephone, using codes, did you not?

A I have contacted Ambassador KURUSU via the

day. 1 imR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, to save time, couldn't they be copied into the record, both of them? The others were not, the other day. They were ordered to be but they were not. I think it would save time if those could be copied into the record. ACTING PRESIDENT: They may be copied into the record. See that the court reporter has a copy and that they are included in the record. (The following are the language corrections above mentioned and the exhibit as corrected:) 11 Record page 4356, line 17, delete "autonomic" 12 and substitute "self-governing." 13 14 Record page 4356, line 19, delete "controller" and substitute "controlling leader." 16 Record page 4357, line 18, delete "construction" 17 and substitute "constructive." 18 Record page 4357, lines 18, 19, delete "in that 19 locality later with pacification" and substitute "on the 20 spot following the cuieting down of." 21 Record page 4357, line 23, delete "Chinese 22

Nationality" and substitute "the lan race."

Record page 4358, lines 1-5, delete "where this action would be taken as anti-revolutionary and an antidemocratic stratagen is beyond our imagination" and

NOTE:

23

24

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

"From: Foreign minister SAIDE IARA "To Consul General KUWASHIMA at TIENTSIN. 2 "Sent on 1 November 1931 3 "Concerning movement to restore to the Throne Emperor Hsuen Tung. "Telegram No. 81 (Code, Urgent. Top Secret) "Re: Your Telegram No. 453. "l. A: our negotiation with the Chinese side on the present intident does not seem to progress smoothly, it is desirable that we on our part should, for the time being, resplete 12the workings of the organs in charge of the main-13tenance of public order and gradually control the 14nner regions in the same way. As to the security 130f Gur rights and interest, which heret fore have Ite sen infringed, we have no other means than to 17have the South Manchurian Railway Company and 18 such others take up the matter as a practical 19 problem of commercial transactions with the Chinese side. Foreover, I feel that with the progress of time, these self-governing organs would gradually develop and as a matter of course would all unite by amalgamation or by the election of a controlling leader or such other means.

1

4

6

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

20 21

22 23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All of the accused are present except SHIRATORI, who is represented by counsel. We have a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo, certifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. This certificate will be recorded and filed.

mr. Chief of Counsel.

SHIGENORI TOGO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CROSS-LXA. INATION (Continued)

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

At the conclusion of the last court session I was referring to statements made by you concerning the activities of HOSHINO and I believe that you recalled that you did not have any recollection as to his using the word "approved." Do you agree that he did say that he did not desire the relaxation of the Japanese conditions regarding the talks with the United States?

THL PRESIDENT: mr. Howard.

AR. HOVA D: The question asked by the Chief of

)

 his own knowledge of what actually did happen. That is what I am trying to bring out, and of course, the other statements are preliminary of that purpose.

We have been reminded many times, are President, of the absence of a jury in these proceedings.

THE PRESIDENT: The matters mentioned by Mr. loward certainly impose no restrictions on the cross-examination. The objection is overruled and the question allowed.

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

Q Did the accused HOSHINO on the occasion referred to state that he did not desire a relaxation of the Japanese conditions regarding the talks with the United States?

A In my recollection the question of stationing troops in China was discussed and adopted at a Liaison conference and at that time HOSHINO stated that at the outset the stationing of troops was necessary.

Q Were you asked this question, and did you give this answer:

"Q In addition, I presume that this Planning Board was created not only for the situation of war, which prevailed in China, but in case of the necessity of becoming involved in a war with other countries?"

And did you answer:

"A It might be said that the Planning Board was created also because of the eventuality or the probability of war with other countries."

A I do recall that such exchange of question and answer took place, but before the question was asked I think that I made a reservation to the effect that the meaning of war as used there was in the broad sense and that war preparations were being spoken of in the very broadest sense of the term.

Q Was the fact true as stated?

A Yes, with the reservations attached thereto.

Q Were you asked this cuestion and did you give this answer:

"Q In his debate prior to November 26th did HOSHINO indicate that the negotiations with relation to the United States should be terminated?"

"A I recall his saying that the Japanese-American talks will not reach a successful culmination."

Vere you asked that question, and did you give that answer?

A I think that refers to the first conferences of the Liaison Conference and in my recollection he said that negotiations would be futile. That was his general, over-all prospects or predictions of the

2

TOGO

3

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

given, and the extent of the outpost of the various countries involved?

A With means of communication very highly developed as they were, I regarded that it would not take more than ten minutes for Washington to telephone its various representatives and outposts in the field and, furthermore, not more than fifteen minutes would be required for Washington to notify Great Britain. This is one of the reasons why I strongly advocated to the High Command that the notification not be delivered in Tokyo but in Washington.

Q And did you pay any attention to the fact that this notice, as you call it, was to be given on a Sunday, a day of worship in the United States of America, where the bureaus were ordinarily closed?

A I knew very well that it was a Sunday, but the organs of the United States Government were giving very great importance to the situation and, as a matter of fact, the President of the United States had returned to Washington from a hot springs resort in view of that situation; and so it was our view that Washington was following the situation very closely and sharply.

O The Hitlerian tactics of week-end excursions

1 2

4

3

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

15

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

above, the information obtained as to the attitude of the United States and Great Britain is of the utmost importance. For it will show that the exercise of the right of self-defense was regretable but an unavoidable course of action which the then leaders of Japan were driven to take. After November the Supreme Command of Japan was considering that a forestalling attack might perchance be made by the Americans at any time.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

defendants, that he had always been strictly obedient to the desires of the Emperor. It will also be proved that he laid before the Throne the matter of obtainint the Imperial sanction for commutation of death sentences imposed upon enemy fliers who raided Tokyo. This act of his he believed to be in accordance with the Emperor's gracious desires.

At this stage of the TOJO case, no other witness will be called other than TOJO himself, who will take the stand to give his own testimony. We are to submit several documents, nearly all of which are either those cited in the TOJO affidavit or those certifying to nonavailability of the original texts of the documents referred to in TOJO's statement, in compliance with the regulations of this Tribunal.

"c. Policy vis-a-vis China. With respect to China, it was decided to prevent assistance to Chiang Kai-shek and eliminate hostile elements. This strategy was adopted because the reasons for the delay in the solution of the China Incident were thought to be, first, Chungking's underestimate of Japan's national strength, and, second, active assistance to Chiang Kai-shek by third powers. It was therefore absolutely necessary that the supply route between America and Britain and Chiang's regime be severed.

"d. The Problem of the Southern Region. The strengthening of national defense against the Soviet Union, and the establishment of a self-sufficient nation were two absolutely essential problems facing Japan at that time. The obstacles blocking the accomplishment of these crucial objectives were (1) the China Incident and (2) pressure from America and Britain. With particular reference to the second obstacle, the controlling factor to be borne in mind was that Japan relied upon America and Britain for the major portion of her imports of essential materials. Once these were cut off the very existence of the nation was endangered. Consequently this problem was viewed with the utmost concern in conjunction with the solution of the China Incident. It was believed that this critical problem could be solved

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, KIDO, and as I also felt it but proper to bring my opinion to the knowledge of the Senior Statesmen, I requested SATO, who at the time was Chief of the Military Affairs Section, to transmit this opinion to ABE and HAYASHI, and he did so. I was advised that SATO transmitted to these men only the message that I had entrusted to him and nothing more, and that the two senior statesmen listened to him report this message with no comment. I say here with quite some determination that the testimony of TANAKA on that point has no factual foundation whatsoever.

"My reason for advocating a member of the Royal blood to head the Cabinet was this: The new Cabinet soon after its formation shall be placed in a position to revise and alter the decision of 6 September. Any Cabinet decision taken by the outgoing Cabinet may be reversed by the incoming Cabinet. But the decision of the Imperial Conference is of a different nature, i.e., it is a decision arrived at by the highest formality involving the participation of the Government as well as the High Command. It was feared that a most perplexing situation would arise in case the High Command refused to consent the revision or alteration of the decision of 6 September. In such an eventuality a Cabinet headed by one of the Royal blood, by reason

Emperor Hsuen Tung would be unpopular in Manchuria proper. More so, the influence of such an event in China proper as well as in other countries under such slogans as anti-revolutionary and as anti-democratic stratagem, is more than can be imagined. In which event it would create a situation likely to make it impossible, ever in the future, to reach an understanding between Japan and China. In any case we can only say that the Restoration to the throne of Emperor Hsuen Tung is a plan which cannot be termed in any way other than completely anachronistic, and I feel that in the future the above will bear great evil in the future management over Manchuria and Mongolia by our Empire.

"4. Also, Liu-Huan-Yeh referred to in telegram No. 1016 despatched from Mukden and addressed to this Minister, is at present staying in Japan investigating the opinion of all quarters and it seems that he has met with strong opposition. Actually the War Minister MINAMI is inclined to oppose the scheme and Lieutenant-General SAKANISHI, it seems, has explained to Liu-Huan-Yeh that his scheme is anachronistic and has requested prudence of the Emperor.

"5. Such being the case, I ask you to keep the above well in mind and do your utmost to stop the

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

abduction plan of Emperor Hsuen Lung on one hand, and on the other hand earnestly propose to the Emperor in a suitable way to be really prudent, and I also ask to be on guard. "This telegram has been relayed to the Minister to China, to Peking, and to Mukden." ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham. MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, in view

1

6

9

10

11

14

13

16 17

18

20

22

23 24

25

we disallow it, because it is our duty to do so.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, then, may I ask that the statement upon which the question is based be stricken from the affidavit for the reason that it is an opinion likewise and a conclusion of the witness and should not be part of his evidence?

THE PRESIDENT: He will not be prejudiced by any misstatement he has made of the law. The matter is closed.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I want to state that I did not wish the matter to go unchallenged.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to cross-examine briefly on behalf of Mr. TOGO.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q You have been cross-examined rather extensively yesterday and today on the question of whether Proposals A and B of the 5th of November, 1941, were Japan's last word. Now, you heard the testimony of the defendant TOGO here, did you not?

A Yes, I did.

Q And do you remember his testimony concerning a conversation which he had with you on the morning of the 2nd of November relative to action to be taken in

...

2

1

5

7

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

we disallow it, because it is our duty to do so.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, then, may I ask that the statement upon which the question is based be stricken from the affidavit for the reason that it is an opinion likewise and a conclusion of the witness and should not be part of his evidence?

THE PRESIDENT: He will not be prejudiced by any misstatement he has made of the law. The matter is closed.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I want to state that I did not wish the matter to go unchallenged.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to cross-examine briefly on behalf of Mr. TOGO.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q You have been cross-examined rather extensively yesterday and today on the question of whether Proposals A and B of the 5th of November, 1941, were Japan's last word. Now, you heard the testimony of the defendant TOGO here, did you not?

A Yes, I did.

Q And do you remember his testimony concerning a conversation which he had with you on the morning of the 2nd of November relative to action to be taken in

tude of the Japanese Government before Hitler's speech.

I now offer in evidence for identification only IPS document 4035, Item 4, a captured German document which is a telegram from the German Ambassador in Tokyo to the State Secretary, bearing date 30 April, 1939; and I offer in evidence IPS document No. 4035, Item 4A, an excerpt therefrom in contradiction of the foregoing testimony of ITAGAKI.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: On behalf of the defendant OSHIMA I object to this document on three grounds. This document has no relevancy or materiality with regard to OSHIMA's case. The contents of this document are nothing more than hearsay. This document — the third reason is that this document was not shown to the witness KAWABE, Torashiro or defendant OSHIMA or defendant ITAGAKI. KAWABE, Torashiro was a Military Attache. From the number of this document it is clear that this document was in the possession of the prosecution before October last year, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT: We think it unimportant. You do not want to argue it, do you? The objection is sustained and the document rejected. We will adjourn until nine-thirty tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment) was taken until Thursday, 15 January, 1948

at 0930.)

"From: Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA
"To Consul General KUWASHIMA at TIENTSIN."

THE PRESIDENT: You have already gone through

that.

MR. SUTTON: (Reading continued)
"Sent on 1 November 1931

"Concerning movement to restore to the Throne Emperor Hsuen Tung.

"Telegram No. 81 (Code, Urgent. Top secret)
"Re: Your Telegram No. 453.

side on the present incident does not seem to progress smoothly, it is desirable that we on our part should, for the time being, replete the workings of the organs in charge of the maintenance of public order and gradually control the inner regions in the same way. As to the security of our rights and interest, which heretofore have been infringed, we have no other means than to have the South Manchurian Railway Company and such others take up the matter as a practical problem of commercial transactions with the Chinese side. Moreover, I feel that with the progress of time, these self-governing organs would gradually develop and as a matter of course would all unite by amalgamation or by the election of a controlling leader or other such means.

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

(Of course, if we can bring about our desired state of affairs through negotiation with the Chinese side, it would be far better.)

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

23

28

However, to form an independent state in l'anchuria at this time would immediately raise a question as being contrary to Section 1, Article 1 of the Washington'Nine Power Pact and would most certainly cause a great dispute among American and other signatory powers of the said Pact. (The Central Military also assents to this point.) And, although the emergence of Emperor Hamen Tung is not immediately connected with the founding of an independent country, other powers might interpret the matter as though we are planning to create an Independent State of Manchuria. (Even if we make it in the form of a voluntary escape of the Emperor, the other Powers are not likely to believe this, and it is extremely difficult to keep incidents of this kind in secrecy.) In any case, the abduction of the Emperor at this time would bring us into the most unfavorable situation in face of the Session of the Board of Directors on 16 November, and world opinion will again be incensed, and our shceme to carry out gradually our actual construc tive work on the spot following the quieting down of world opinion would be greatly handicapped.

"3. Moreover, taking into consideration the fact that almost the whole population of Manchuria of

Emperor Hsuen Tung would be unpopular in Manchuria proper.

More so, the influence of such an event in where this action would be taken as anti-revolutionary and an anti-democratic stratagem is beyond our imagination, in which event it would create a situation likely to make it impossible ever in the future to reach an understanding between Japan and China. In any case we can only say that the Restoration to the throne of Emperor Hsuen Tung is a plan which cannot be termed in any other way then completely anachronistic, and I feel that in the future the above will bear great evil in the future management over Manchuria and Mongolia by our Empire.

"4. Also, Liu-Huan-Yeh referred to in telegram No. 1016 despatched from Mukden and addressed to this Ministry, is at present investigating the opinion of all quarters and it seems that he has met with strong opposition. Actually the War Minister MINAMI is inclined to oppose the scheme and Lieutenant-General SAKANISHI, it seems, has explained to Liu-Huan-Yeh that his scheme is anachronistic and has requested prudence of the Emperor.

"5. Such being the case, I ask you to keep the above well in mind and do your utmost to stop the abduction plan of Emperor Hauen Lung on one hand, and

.

.

on the other hand carnestly propose to the Emperor in a suitable way to be really prudent, and I also ask you to be on guard.

"This telegram has been relayed to the Minister to China, to Peking, and to Mukden."

7 8

7

LO

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

1219, Okamoto-Machi, Setagaya, Tokyo.

"2. At the time of the Mukden Incident of September 18th, 1931, I was the Foreign Minister, while General MINAMI was the War Minister, both being members of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet.

"On the morning of September 19, i.e., the next day after the outbreak of the Incident, an extraordinary Cabinet meeting was called. On that occasion, I reported the receipt of a telegram from the Japanese Consul-General in Mukden to the Foreign Office, stating that a little after 10 o'clock of the 18th the Chinese troops had blown up the South Manchurian Railway lines in the vicinity of Liutiokuo, Mukden -- (end reading)

That is misspelled there. It should be: L-i-u (dash) T'-i-a-u (dash) K-o-u.

(Reading continued):

-- and clashed with our railway garrison.

War Minister MINAMI then reported that he also had received a similar telegram from the Kwantung Army. As these telegraphic reports from the district concerned were very brief, the situation was too obscure for the government to make any judgment at that time. (end reading)

I would like to submit here, if the Court

substitute", under such slogans as anti-revolutionary and as anti-democratic stratagem, is more than can be imagined."

Also, delete "Moreover, it would make it quite impossible for us to reach an understanding with China forever in the future" and substitute "In which event, it would create a situation likely to make it impossible. ever in the future, to reach an understanding between Japan and China."

Record page 4358, lines 7-8, delete "quite erroneous of time" and substitute "which can not be termed in any way other than completely anachronistic."

Record page 4358, lines 11-12, delete "According to telegram No. 1016 addressed to me, Liu-Huan-Yeh at present is" and substitute "Also, Liu-Huan-Yeh referred to in telegram No. 1016 dispatched from Mukden and addressed to this Minister, is at present."

Record page 4358, line 14, delete "Even" and substitute "Actually."

Record page 4358, line 17, delete "erroneous of time" and substitute "anachronistic."

Record page 4358, line 23, insert "really" between "be" and "prudent."

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

```
on the other hand earnestly propose to the Emperor in
 2 a suitable way to be really prudent, and I also ask
   to be on guard.
             "This telegram has been relayed to the
  Minister to China, to Peking, and to Mukden."
             ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.
 7
             MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, in view
 8
 9
10
11
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
21
22
23
24
2.5
```

Q Well, you had a conversation with Mr. Hallett Abend in Shanghai in January 1938?

A Yes, I saw him twice.

Q And you sent for him?

A Having heard various reports at that time I met Mr. Abend to hear from him what he had heard and also on the basis of the facts that I knew to impart the factual information that I had in my possession to him.

Q In other words, you wanted to quell the rumors that were abroad in the land at that time?

A Well, "quell" is hardly the word to be used in such an instance as this. My desire was to see that the truth and the facts was reported.

Q The only reason I use the word is because you used it at page 3,463 of the record, in exhibit 257. You were asked in your interrogation this question:

"Q When did you first see Hallett Abend after the Nanking capture?"

The answer was:

"A I met him in China. I first met Mr. Abend after, perhaps a month after, Nanking."

"Q Did Mr. Abend ask for an interview and get it?

"A No, I requested Mr. Abend to see me as I had

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

3

5

7

9

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

22

23

heard rumors and I wished to quell these by putting the facts before Mr. Abend."

Is that what took place, General MATSUI?

A Yes.

Q And what rumors are you referring to when you mention this conversation with Mr. Abend?

A Well, as you, Mr. Prosecutor, have suggested, as referring to the many outrages alleged to have been committed by the Japanese troops in Nanking, and my desire was to tell Mr. Abend of the truth of the situation as I believed it, and although there were many foreign correspondents in Shanghai at the time, I felt that Mr. Abend was the most trustworthy of these correspondents and therefore I met him.

Q Who was alleging that these atrocities had been committed?

A Well, as to who were talking about these outrages, I cannot say concretely but I should think that the sources of such rumors were for the most part Chinese and foreigners who had heard from Chinese who were passing on the information, perhaps in fun.

Q Well, apart from the funny side of it, who passed on the information to you?

A Well, who it was I do not now recall, but it was one of my subordinates.

2

1

4

3

6

5

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

2.2

23

heard rumors and I wished to quell these by putting the facts before Mr. Abend."

CROSS

Is that what took place, General MATSUI?

A Yes.

And what rumors are you referring to when you mention this conversation with Mr. Abend?

Well, as you, Mr. Prosecutor, have suggested, as referring to the many outrages alleged to have been committed by the Japanese troops in Nanking, and my desire was to tell Mr. Abend of the truth of the situation as I believed it, and although there were many foreign correspondents in Shanghai at the time, I felt that Mr. Abend was the most trustworthy of these correspondents and therefore I met him.

Who was alleging that these atrocities had been committed?

Well, as to who were talking about these outrages, I cannot say concretely but I should think that the sources of such rumors were for the most part Chinese and foreigners who had heard from Chinese who were passing on the information, perhaps in fun.

Well, apart from the funny side of it, who passed on the information to you?

Well, who it was I do not now recall, but it was one of my subordinates.

2 3

1

4

6

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Q Probably your Chief of Staff?

A Yes.

Q Now, you were going to tell Mr. Abend what the facts were so that there would be no misapprehension about the true state of affairs?

A Yes.

Q But you had received no report of your investigators at this time?

A No, but I had been receiving fragmentary reports.

Q Fragmentary reports? From whom?

A I am referring to reports of the gendarmerie.

Q Did you receive more than one report from the gendarmerie?

A I myself did not receive them directly but my staff officers were receiving them daily.

Q Daily since the fall of Nanking?

A Yes.

And those reports were, of course, communicated to you as the Commander in Chief of the Army, weren't they?

A As the gendarmerie were not my direct subordinates, but the subordinates of the Commanders of the Armies, the reports were made to those Commanders and not to me. MATSUI

Q And what did the Commanders of the Armies do with the reports when they received them from the Kempeitai?

CROSS

A When the facts were clearly unraveled and known, the offender was tried at a court martial and punished.

Q Now, just to go back a moment: You mention fragmentary reports from the Kempeitai in the hands of your staff officers. You mean staff officers on your staff as Commander in Chief, do you not?

A Yes.

Q And those reports were brought to your knowledge?

army was the responsibility of the Division Commander. The Commander of the Army above the Division Commanders supervised these Division Commanders and maintained the court martial under his jurisdiction. I was above them. I was the Commander above them and my Area Army Headquarters had no legal organ nor any military police or gendarmerie under its direct control, and therefore reports were not made to my headquarters or to me directly. It would be more proper to say that the facts were brought to my attention or communicated to me for reference purposes.

12

13

10

11

14

16 17

18

20

21

23

24

33,573

SHIDEHARA

1 K p 3 e a u & K n

9

11 12

10

15

13

16 17

19

20

18

21 22

23 24

25

ACTING PRESIDENT: I don't think we care to hear any more of your argument, Mr. Carr.

Captain Brooks, inasmuch as Colonel Warren has brought up the point that the documents presented by the prosecution go beyond the scope of the witness' affidavit, I think it would be convenient for the Court to hear your argument on that point now.

MR. BROOKS: I would first like to state from the record, at page 19,891, that in relation to these documents which the prosecution were supposedly crossexamining MINAMI on, as we suspected at that time, the prosecution should have put these documents into evidence if the witness denied them. To make it clear what the ruling of the Court might be in such a case, I stated as follows at line 7 on page 19,891:

"Mr. Brooks: I take it, your Honor, that if the prosecution asks the witness on a document that he says he has, as to what the witness has stated, and the witness states he does not or he doesn't say it, the prosecution is bound by the answer unless the prosecution puts the document into evidence to show that he didn't state otherwise."

Mr. Comyns Carr interrupted and said:

"Your Honor, nobody would dispute that proposition, but the question is, at what stage it is proper to

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

19

18

22

21

25

24

the Liaison Conference, well, I am inclined to feel that way also.

- Q You have also heard it testified here, have you not, by one of your co-defendants that copies of that document were distributed in the Liaison Conference?
 - A No, I don't believe it.
- Q You mean you don't believe it has been so testified or you don't believe it was done?
 - A I do not believe the fact.
- Q Upon being interrogated by the International Prosecution Section prior to the commencement of these proceedings were you asked whether you had seen that draft? And did you reply that you had?

A Well, I somewhat recall that, but at that time my recollections themselves were very vague.

Q You recall that you did say it, but you think your recollection is better now, is that it?

A At that time when I was interrogated on various questions I had not thoroughly surveyed and studied the situation on which I was being interrogated. Later, as a result of trying to recall my memory, I have come to the result which I have already spoken to you about in connection with my present state — the present state of my recollection.

Q Now, your present recollection is, then, that

NOTE:

The attached pages are corrected pages and should be substituted for the corresponding pages in the record.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR, SUTTON:

Q When you arrived in Berlin in March 1938 did you learn that the Japanese Military Attache, General OSHIMA, was working for the strengthening of the Anti-Comintern Pact?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We object to that for the reason that that is the line that was eliminated from the affidavit in order to avoid a lengthy cross-examination upon that subject.

THE PRESIDENT:: That does not make the crossexamination inadmissible. The defense cannot control the cross-examination in that way.

The objection is overruled and the question allowed.

A If by when I arrived in Berlin you mean on the very day that I arrived in Berlin, your question is somewhat wrong, because I meant that it was after some time had elapsed after my arrival in Berlin that I learned of this.

- Q When did you learn of this?
- A Some time in March.
- Q Is it not a fact that the Military Attache,
 OSHIMA, was at the time negotiating directly with
 Foreign Minister Ribbentrop without informing Ambassa-

6

1

3

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

23

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR, SUTTON:

Q When you arrived in Berlin in March 1938 did you learn that the Japanese Military Attache, General OSHIMA, was working for the strengthening of the Anti-Comintern Pact?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We object to that for the reason that that is the line that was eliminated from the affidavit in order to avoid a lengthy cross-examination upon that subject.

THE PRESIDENT:: That does not make the crossexamination inadmissible. The defense cannot control the cross-examination in that way.

The objection is overruled and the question allowed.

A If by when I arrived in Berlin you mean on the very day that I arrived in Berlin, your question is somewhat wrong, because I meant that it was after some time had elapsed after my arrival in Berlin that I learned of this.

- Q When did you learn of this?
- A Some time in March.
- Q Is it not a fact that the Military Attache,
 OSHIMA, was at the time negotiating directly with
 Foreign Minister Ribbentrop without informing Ambassa-

2

5

7

ð

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BLAKENEY: As proof of the details of the defendant TOGO's absence from Tokyo and from his office at the time of Italy's entrance into the Anti-Comintern Pact, I offer in evidence defense document 2866, a Foreign Minister's certificate.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2866

will receive exhibit No. 3616.

(Whereupon the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3616 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I might state, without reading it, that it shows that he was ordered on a trip to Manchukuo on the 7th of October and actually left on the 10th of October, 1937.

The next witness is KAMEYAMA, Kazuji whose affidavit is defense document 2753. This witness has previously testified before the Tribunal.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the witness KAMEYAMA is in court. He has previously been sworn before this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former oath.

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BLAKENEY: As proof of the details of the d fendant TOGO's absence from Tokyo and from his office at the time of Italy's entrance into the Anti-Comintern Pact, I offer in evidence defense document 2866, a Foreign Minister's certificate.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2866 will receive exhibit No. 3616.

(Whereupon the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3616 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I might state, without reading it, that it shows that he was ordered on a trip to Manchukuo on the 7th of October and actually left on the 10th of October, 1937.

The next witness is KAMEYAMA, Kazuji whose affidavit is defense document 2753. This witness has previously testified before the Tribunal.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the witness KAMEYAMA is in court. He has previously been sworn before this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: You are still on your former oath.

25

23

A Well, this is an old opinion of mine. For instance, I have always -- I, myself, have always been opposed and disliked the idea of an active army officer becoming Prime Minister.

Q I am not interested, Mr. Witness, in you trying to excuse yourself. I am asking you a date, When did you form that opinion?

A I think from about the time of the conclusion of the Tripartite Alliance.

Q At the time of the conclusion of the Tripartite Alliance you thought that the ToJo Cabinet was formed and organized for military action?

A Of course not. The Tripartite Military
Alliance was concluded before the organization of the
TOJO Cabinet?

Q Mr. Witness, I am asking you a very simple question. I want a date. When did you form the opinion that the TOJO Cabinet was organized for military action?

A Well, I have no recollection as to the exact date -- what day of what month.

Q Well, was it 1945 or 1941?

A Well, no, that was 1941.

Q Now, what month was it in 1941?

A Well, that is the way I thought about the

3

6

8

10

11

12

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24